

# Spearhead

£1.50


No. 373 MARCH 2000

ISSN 1364-7105

## A VERY QUEER GOVERNMENT!

*Why have  
Tatchell & Co.  
got the Prime  
Minister dancing  
to their tune?*

(SEE PAGE FOUR)





# WHAT WE THINK

## More of the 'booming economy' con-trick

Our mainly Tory press just will not stop telling us that the British economy is doing well — despite all the evidence to the contrary.

One of the most recent examples of the con-trick was a report in the *Daily Mail* on February 10th headed 'Britain's economy is at its booming best'. And what facts did the report provide to back up its story? We'll list a few.

One was that "British employees pay lower taxes on earnings than most of their continental counterparts."

That, as a barometer of national economic health, is almost meaningless. It could be argued in reply that many of Britain's public services are among the very worst in Europe — state education, transport and roads, health, just to mention the first that come to mind. Throughout most of the continent, far more money is spent on these services than here, one important

reason for higher taxation.

Another fact trotted out is that labour costs are lower in Britain than over most of the continent. Again, what does that prove in terms of economic well being? Merely that we pay our workers less.

And, as a result of these lower labour costs, incoming investment is greater in Britain than elsewhere in Europe. Big deal! That simply means that foreigners are buying up more of our economy than they are those of our neighbours. This in turn means that more of the decisions affecting our livelihoods are made overseas — beyond our control.

An example of this is last month's announcement of 1,500 job cuts at Ford Motors at Dagenham, and this is accompanied by a threat to close down the plant altogether. Of course, these decisions are made in Detroit, U.S.A., not here. When foreigners control our industries, they have virtual power of life or death over us.

Yet another assumed token of economic success is the claim that Britain is now the world's largest overseas investor — eclipsing even the United States. British-based companies, so the report said, "poured £132 billion into overseas investment last year — 78 per cent more than in 1998 and £37 billion more than that spent by US firms."

Does that make our economy stronger than that of the United States?

All that these figures of inward and outward investment show is that the British economy is much more *globally* based than those of her competitors, nothing else. We are less in control of our own economic

destiny than they are of theirs — not more prosperous, not more productive, not more competitive.

Boosters of the 'success' theory of the British economy are often keen on making favourable comparisons with that of the Germans. The fact remains that Germany, notwithstanding certain current problems, still produces 50 per cent more *per capita* than Britain. Our roads are chock full of German-made motor vehicles. How many British-made motor vehicles are to be seen on the roads of Germany? In fact, how many British-made motor vehicles are to be seen on roads anywhere these days?

The figure for investment of British capital overseas is interesting: £132 billion. This compares with a figure for investment of foreign capital in Britain amounting to £39 billion last year. In other words, we invest more than three times as much abroad than foreigners invest here.

The big question that remains unanswered is why, if British investors have all that money available to buy into foreign companies, can they not instead invest it in British companies and enable us to own and control more of our own industry?

## British farming: a forgotten principle

Prime Minister Blair, as most people know, spent a good part of last month going around trying to woo Britain's farmers. From all accounts, he didn't have too much success.

Tony apparently thinks that farmers, and country-dwellers generally, really have it much better than they think they do. As if putting himself up as an expert on country life, he listed some of the benefits of living in the country. One of them which deserves to be treated with hilarity was his claim that the country is far safer and more crime-free than the cities. This, of course, is true generally speaking. But as to just *why* it is true Tony would doubtless prefer not to debate the matter. It might lead to a discussion of the vastly different nature of city and country populations and their differing propensities towards crime. Tony would rather not get involved in *that* subject!

But one idea on which Tony seems to be following on the tails of the Tories is the classic 'free-market' idea that, if British farmers cannot make a good living doing what they do, they should go and do something else. A similar tune has been played by some newspaper writers recently, who have proclaimed their lack of sympathy for the farmers on the grounds that some of them are to blame for their own problems and should therefore be left to go to the wall — classic Thatcherite Tory doctrine. The same people say the same thing, of course, with regard to manufacturing indus-

## Spearhead

No. 373 MARCH 2000

c/o PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW

Editor: John Tyndall

*Spearhead* exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British Nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its Editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless it is specifically stated otherwise, the views expressed in signed articles or letters in *Spearhead* are the sole responsibility of their writers and should not be taken as representing the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation that *Spearhead* may support editorially.

*Spearhead* welcomes enquiries from prospective advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of the month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse, without giving reasons, to publish any advertisement submitted. The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* does not necessarily indicate that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function being advertised.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts for articles for possible publication. The most useful lengths are of around 1,000 to 1,850 words. *Spearhead* is currently produced using World Perfect 5.1 software. Articles sent on 3" computer disk will be welcome if compatible. To ensure acceptance, however, they should also be sent in printed or typewritten format. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless the writers specifically request otherwise. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles submitted for publication.

Those wishing to reprint *Spearhead* articles in other publications should ensure when doing so to give public acknowledgement to both the writer and *Spearhead*, and to include in the acknowledgement the magazine's full address.



tries.

This mindset seems to result from a complete incapacity to take a *national view* of things. What we should be thinking about is whether it is a desirable and necessary thing for Britain to have a strong and thriving farming industry, producing as much of our own food as possible and employing as many people as possible — consistent with reasonable efficiency and cost-effectiveness. This is a far more important question than that of whether the odd farmer or two is to blame for his own fortunes and does not deserve to stay in business.

We believe that it is a desirable and necessary thing for Britain to have a strong farming industry along the lines described, just as we believe it desirable and necessary for us to have a strong manufacturing industry along the same lines. This means that what has to be done to ensure the achievement of these goals *must* be done — quite regardless of the deserts of the odd individual farmer or manufacturer. And if 'free-market' rules are inadequate to these needs, those rules should be scrapped and others adopted.

## Ulster: appeasement policy in ruins


Not for the first time, it falls to *Spearhead* to say: "We told you so." In our January issue, John Tyndall went to some lengths, in his article 'Peace in Ulster: the pathetic delusion', to warn against the hope that anything useful would come from the Good Friday Agreement over Northern Ireland, signed in 1998. It was always clear that the IRA would never willingly de-commission its stockpile of weapons; indeed neither IRA leaders, nor their pals in Sinn Féin, ever said that this would happen. Yet the Blair Government, just in order to score some brownie points with the voters, persisted in maintaining the pretence that this might happen. The Government, and Britain, have got absolutely nothing out of the Agreement, whereas the IRA has obtained the release of hundreds of its operatives from jail and the promise of freedom for the remainder. The moment the terrorists decide to go back to bombing and shooting — which it is probable they will do very soon — they will be in a position to mobilise all their forces for such operations.

Writers in *Spearhead* have been saying, year in, year out, that appeasement of Irish Republicans will never work. Yet the received wisdom of the times has been that we must keep alive the hope that peace can come to Northern Ireland by way of such 'deals' with the murderers and their supporters.

Even now, in the face of the clearest evidence yet that there is going to be no

giving up of weapons, our Government is still chasing phantoms, hoping that there may be a modification of the stance of Sinn Féin/IRA on this issue. Tony & Co. are showing themselves to be the biggest suckers in history. Is it surprising that Gerry Adams is going about these days with an ever more contemptuous sneer on his face? He has good reason!

**ADAMS:**  
He has more reason than ever to wear his familiar sneer of contempt.



We say it again — repeating ourselves to the point of tedium: the only realistic way to peace in Northern Ireland is to turn the security forces on the IRA with the order to do everything necessary to *smash* it — totally and permanently!

## Hysteria over Haider

Reading some of the news and commentaries following the granting of places in the Austrian Government to members of the Freedom Party of Jörg Haider, one could be forgiven for thinking one was watching a world gone totally insane.

Our own Government in Britain, together with others in the European Union, issued messages of condemnation, together with announcements of diplomatic sanctions. They were joined by the governments of the United States, Canada and Israel. Needless to say, our joke of a Foreign Secretary Robin Cook added his voice to the clamour of opprobrium.

At the same time, big demonstrations against Austria were organised across the world, including one in Vienna itself on the 19th February. In a number of these, violent mobs took to the streets.

All this was in response to a perfectly democratic decision by the Austrian people, who gave Herr Haider's party a 27-per-cent vote in an election last October — support that is now reported by a poll to have risen to 33 per cent.

If Haider were the diabolical 'racist', 'anti-semitic' and 'nazi' that the *Guardian*-reading classes and their left-wing fellow-thinkers claim he is, this would still be preposterous. How Austria orders her affairs is her own business. She is a sovereign country with the right to make her own decisions.

But there is no evidence that Haider is any of these things. On the contrary, he gives every sign of being just a political opportunist whose speeches and slogans are tailored to whatever audience he happens currently to be speaking to — in other words, very much par for the course among contemporary politicians all over the world, including our own.

Haider's party does claim that there are too many foreigners in Austria. With one million of them there among a total population of seven million, that is not an unreasonable assertion.

So what, anyway, is all the fuss about? What, anyway, gives outsiders the right to lecture to Austria on how it should order its internal affairs?

The huge ruckus that has been whipped up just demonstrates the *hubris* that has taken hold of the globalists of the EU and elsewhere. However little danger Haider represents to anybody, and however unlikely it could be that a nation the size of Austria could constitute a 'threat' to world peace, these people simply cannot tolerate a situation in which a person who is not their willing puppet leads a party whose members sit in government — anywhere.

Haider, whatever else, has done the world one big favour: his success has acted as a catalyst which has brought these insufferable people out from under the stones and goaded them into revealing themselves in the light of day.

## The 'racist' crime that wasn't

Two black men, uncle and nephew Harold and Jason McGowan, were found hanged in Telford, Shropshire. Immediately, Britain's most politically correct national news-papers, *The Guardian* and *The Independent*, jumped to the conclusion that this must be a 'racist' murder, and began shrill 'anti-racist' campaigns over the matter, with talk of Telford's 'white supremacists' and the need to combat them.

But there was one little problem. The local police stated that there was not a shred of evidence to suggest that the men's deaths had any link with a racial motive.


Shortly afterwards, another man was found hanged in a situation which bore close similarities to the earlier one, and which led the police to link the two cases of death together. This man was *white*.

But none of this deterred the two news-papers. They remained quite adamant that 'racism' was at the back of it all, no doubt hoping that they had another Stephen Lawrence case to wax on about. Indeed they positively *wanted* the murders to be 'racist', and had little regard for the feelings of those bereaved as, with cynical fanaticism, they pursued their 'race crime' theory.

As someone once said of the press, why let the facts get in the way of a good story?



# Why is Blair the homo lobby's poodle?



"It is, as I say, difficult to fathom exactly why Mr. Blair persists with this issue. He must realise in his heart of hearts that he is swimming against a tidal wave of public opinion.

"It is quickly destroying his reputation for sure-footed government. It is hard not to believe that he is a prisoner of the gay lobby whose ambassadors sit around the Cabinet table."

LEO McINSTRY

*The Mail on Sunday* (13.2.00)

PRIME MINISTER BLAIR has a mountain of problems on his hands. The Health Service is collapsing. The armed forces are short of bullets for their firearms, maintenance for their planes and fuel for their ships. The Ulster 'Peace Plan' is in ruins. Devolution in Scotland and Wales is proving a fiasco. The flood of refugees is reaching epidemic proportions. The much heralded 'Millennium Dome' is turning out a huge white elephant. Grass roots members of the Labour Party are getting fed up to the back teeth with the self-appointed Islington élite.

Yet Tony seems impervious to these problems. In recent weeks he has been ruled by what seems to be a complete obsession with the so-called 'rights' of Britain's homosexuals.

First there's the drive to Repeal Clause 28 of local government laws, whereby education authorities may not promote homo lifestyles in schools. After the Lords threw out Tony's Bill, it was revealed that he now plans to create 50 pro-gay peers in order to get it through.

Then the Commons passed another Bill lowering the homosexual age of consent to 16.

Not least, Tony's 'Millennium Dome' was given up on February 12th to a gigantic 'gay' jamboree, which appalled parents who had been planning to visit the place with their kids on the same day.

Tony Blair wants to be popular with the voters — all politicians do.

Yet it's clear that the vast majority of voters are repelled by the way he sucks up to Britain's queer fraternity. He is fast losing popularity on this issue — just at a time when he needs all the friends he can get.

So why is Tony so frantic to please the 'gays'? Perhaps they know something the ordinary British public doesn't know. Is there something in his past — as in the past of Michael Portillo, for instance — which he'd rather have hushed up? Is Tony being blackmailed?

Because we think it high time that our premier dropped all this time-wasting nonsense and got on with the job of governing Britain!



# The things they're saying

Why are so many people apparently convinced that homosexuality is wrong, or at any rate undesirable? The answer, I think, is simple: buggery is bad for you. This is not something people tend to come right out and say, but it's true. I think that it is this that underlies the religious view, and this explains the secular fears.

When heterosexuals talk of homosexuals ... they are thinking of homosexual buggery and promiscuity in parks, and hoping it isn't something that is going to catch on in a big way, since it is so very obviously a dreadful health hazard.

**MINETTE MARRIN**  
*Daily Telegraph* (28.1.00)

Tony Blair can hardly have been surprised by his chilly reception at the National Farmers' Union yesterday. Indeed, with the industry so sunk in crisis, he may feel he got away lightly.

But the Prime Minister would be sadly mistaken if he thinks that our 170,000 farmers are too few to matter. In many respects, the British countryside defines the British people. This is a nation which deeply values its fields and woodlands, and treasures its villages and admires those who have made our landscape possible.

Mr. Blair may speak for Islington and the chattering metropolitan classes. But there is a wider public which is increasingly tempted to believe that the only interest New Labour has in the countryside lies in abolishing foxhunting, promoting GM crops and ensuring that homosexual studies are pumped out in our dwindling number of rural schools.

**LEADER ARTICLE**  
*Daily Mail* (2.2.00)

Princess Tony and Peter Mandelson pressured the Ulster Unionists into allowing IRA mouthpieces into the government of Northern Ireland. They urged the Unionist leader, David Trimble, to "jump first," and so expose the real attitude of the IRA and its tail, Sinn Féin. The IRA, who rightly point out that they never promised to disarm, even in the wretched unsigned Good Friday Agreement, must have laughed until their balaclavas were soaked with tears.

Only a complete sucker would have thought that people who would be nothing without guns would lay those guns down.

We are so far down the road to surrender that it would be incredibly difficult to turn back... We are not a warlike people any more, so we must expect to be treated with scorn.

**PETER HITCHENS**  
*The Express* (31.1.00)

## EXTRACTS FROM THE MAINSTREAM MEDIA

A war crime is not an absolute to be applied impartially across the world. It is conditional; and the first condition, overriding rules of evidence or the nature of the actual crime, is that its perpetrator must be on the losing side. If Mr. Kalejs (*wanted for alleged crimes while serving with the German forces in WWII. Ed.*) had had the good sense to be with the Soviet forces who massacred the Polish officers in Katyn, he would tonight be going to his bed in Leicestershire. Instead, he is an 86-year-old homeless refugee from *Le Code Janner*, unconvicted in any court, but a pariah, nonetheless, forlornly shuttling between the airports of the planet. That is not just unedifying; it is a moral outrage.

**KEVIN MYERS**  
*Sunday Telegraph* (9.1.00)

Supporters of European integration, and of the globalisation of which it is part, have no qualms about overturning the results of a democratic election to advance their aims. Just as the negative result of the first Danish referendum on Maastricht in 1992 was cancelled by a second referendum on the same text in 1993, so throughout the 1990s European governments and the United States have interfered in elections across Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union to support politicians who bend the knee to the doctrine of the end of national sovereignty. Integrated into the European Union, these controlled governments will provide institutional lobby fodder in EU councils to outvote any country like Britain which might be foolish enough to try standing up for its own interests...

The tactic, of course, is to demonise the enemy as a Nazi. It is a ruse which can be deployed limitlessly. Everyone is Hitler now, from Pat Buchanan and Jörg Haider to Saddam Hussein and Slobodan Milosevic, with regular doses of Latvians thrown in for good measure. This trick is now so massively abused that it ought to be discounted as irredeemably debased.

**JOHN LAUGHLAND**  
*The Spectator* (5.2.00)

Anyone who dissents is subjected to nasty name-calling.

Don't want gay propaganda peddled in schools? Homophobe.

Don't want to be ruled by Brussels? Little Englander.

Think the Stephen Lawrence inquiry went too far? Racist.

Question the government's surrender in Northern Ireland? Enemy of peace.

Think if something ain't broke, don't fix

it? You're part of the forces of conservatism.

This is student union sloganising. It isn't grown-up government.

**RICHARD LITTLEJOHN**  
*The Sun* (1.2.00)

By coincidence, I flew over the Dome at a few thousand feet on my return from Jamaica last week, and found myself averting my eyes from the view of London stretched out below. It is true that some handsome buildings survive — Westminster Palace, Horse Guards, Somerset House, St. Pauls; the Thames does its best to improve things — but the simple truth is that the overall view of London from above is utterly hideous...

We can blame the architects, and I honestly believe that by the evidence of what they have actually built, Britain must have the worst architects in the world. But architects have to cater for penny-pinching, opportunistic clients who insist on cheap materials and shoddy construction. We can blame the planning authorities for letting people get away with it, but... they are not under constant pressure not to stand in the way of jobs for the building industry. The real culprit must be found in a form of national stupidity that has descended, in the new, uneducated, People's Britain, into a total philistinism.

**AUBERON WAUGH**  
*Daily Telegraph* (6.2.00)

I applaud Kevin Keegan's call for a restriction in the number of foreign players in English football clubs.

Since football clubs turned themselves into profit-driven plcs., the pressure for short-term results dictates that importing foreign players is given preference to developing and bedding-in young English players. The clubs see the national game more and more as a distraction to their pursuit of shareholder value.

Of course, the same has been happening with British industry and commerce for some time. First it was manufacturing — cars, trucks, computers, electronics, etc.; then utilities, insurance and investment banking; now even defence industries are being sold. As a German businessman who has been living in the UK for 30 years, this never ceases to amaze me. A people who are so proud about their sovereignty do not mind when the decision about 20,000 jobs in the Midlands is taken in Munich instead of Coventry...

**BOB BISCHOF**  
*Letter, Sunday Times* (6.2.00)



# ON THE MEANING OF BRITISHNESS

*It is time, says JOHN TYNDALL, that we knew precisely who we are*

MANY READERS will have seen the three-part series *The White Tribe*, shown on Channel Four in January, which was the subject of comment in these pages last month. One of the noticeable features of this programme, narrated by West Indian immigrant Darcus Howe, was the focus on native Britons who did not seem to be certain about their own identity. "Define what being British (or English) means to you," said Howe in so many words on more than one occasion. Not unpredictably, those questioned were stumped for a clear and concise answer.

This, of course, was one of the main objects of the programme. Howe and his TV paymasters know full well that a very large number of British people — probably the majority — are unhappy about the vast ethnic and cultural changes befalling their country over the past half-century. But they know equally well that most of those same British people would be reluctant to give full vent to these feelings on television before an audience of millions. Quite apart from giving a thought to what some of the neighbours might think (that nice Pakistani gentleman, for instance, who runs the convenience store on the corner and whom one would hate to offend), these people are basically polite. When a guest is in your house, you don't want to be rude to him and hurt his feelings. You try and think of the most charitable things to say about him and dismiss from your mind the least charitable. That is very British; in normal times it is a national virtue, but it can in certain abnormal times put us at an acute disadvantage. No-one, it seemed, wanted to define their nationality and its concomitant customs and traditions in such language as might seem arrogant, patronising or overbearing towards Mr. Howe. So there was a certain groping for words by those to whom the question was put, and no very convincing explanation was forthcoming.

But there was another factor at work here beside politeness and the desire not to offend. These British natives probably could not answer convincingly the question of what being British meant to them because the reign of political correctness across our land has so stifled discussion of the subject that the only answers to hand would most probably be silly ones, replete with inhibitions and blighted by ignorance.

Yet this is a subject very simple in its parameters and capable of perfectly clear



**QUINTESSENTIAL BRITISH TYPE**  
This is a First World War Captain, looking the personification of the fine breed that defended us in those dramatic days of our history. It is patently obvious that he is neither Negro, Asian nor Arab. This is intended as no slight to those races, only as an affirmation of what is British and what is not. Yet today our people are confused over their identity and taught that it is 'evil' to wish that this type survives into the future as a guardian of their heritage.

exposition. There is no reason whatever why we should be tongue-tied when it is raised. It occurred to me while I was watching this programme that the time is long overdue for a bit of simplicity in definition which would spare British people — and particularly spokesmen and -women for the nationalist viewpoint — the embarrassment they frequently suffer when put on the spot over the matter and are unable to translate basic feelings into articulate speech.

## OUR IDENTITY

So for a moment I will put myself in the position of an interviewee on a TV programme asked to define what being British was — something I might indeed have been on the *White Tribe* programme had an original request to me to appear on it not subsequently

been cancelled. This is something like what I would have said:-

"We British are the indigenous peoples of the British Isles. We are made up of various original tribal groups but all of these were European and the vast majority came from Northern Europe. We are therefore essentially a North European people. By no possible token are we a 'mixture' of races.

"As a further definition of who and what we are, I can state emphatically what we are *not*. We are not Negroes. We are not Asians of any description. We are not Arabs. We are not Latin Americans. We have never been anything other than *white*.

"In other words, we are a race — the *British Race*. Our national character — whatever historical and environmental factors may have played a part in forming it — is primarily a product of our racial origins."

Such words, of course, would not suffice to give anything like a full explanation of 'Britishness', as it is sometimes called. They would merely serve as an introduction. From that point on, definitions of how we see ourselves, and of why we believe in the importance of our self-preservation as a group, would proceed in the course of dialogue — in other words as answers to questions which would challenge our perception of ourselves in many details.

The sea, and of course the development of our unique English language, combined with hundreds of years of national tradition and distinct cultural evolution, have forged us British as a people separate and apart even from the other Northern Europeans from which most of us spring, so that we can today say also that we are not Germans, Danes, Norwegians or Flemings. However, the ethnic and cultural closeness to us of these peoples means that their settlement in this country would pose no great problems to us in the way of integration and assimilation. Within a generation, no trace of difference would exist except for family surnames. On the other hand, Afro-Caribbeans bearing such names as 'Smith', 'Jones', 'Brown' or 'Robinson' would forever constitute factors of differentiation through the survival of their wholly foreign and unassimilable genes.

This is said entirely without 'hate'. There can be quite amicable relations between us native British and the other races of the world — providing that the latter do not occupy our living space and come to form part of our population by intermarriage and ethnic mixing.



We want, in other words, to remain the people we are — the people we have been for countless centuries. Is that a crime? Everywhere in the world, environmentalists and conservationists are calling on us to ensure that we preserve elephants, tigers, rhinos, red squirrels, white whales and eagles as distinct species. If it is right that we should do this — and I, for one, believe that it is — what on earth can be wrong with us, the indigenous peoples of the British Isles, wishing also to be preserved?

Yet this very basic instinct of self-preservation — the right of every people, nation, tribe, beast, fish and bird to survive with its unique identity maintained intact — has today been branded with a word able to strike fear and horror into its targeted audience: the word 'racism'. "Oh no, I'm not a racist..." protests the nervous little housewife who has witnessed with alarm the alien takeover of her neighbourhood, and even spoken apprehensively about it to her (white) neighbour, but now finds the TV interviewer's mike thrust aggressively into her face while cameras point like lethal weapons in her direction, "but..." and so the takeover goes on. The lady is of course a racist — like the vast majority of Whites, Blacks and Asians in this country — but she is both frightened to say so and confused as to what the word means anyway.


## OUR ACHIEVEMENT

Let us take a little further the question of what it means to be British. We have defined who we are and where we are coming from — what gives us our identity. Is it then a matter of supreme importance whether this identity should be changed — not just changed marginally by the infusion of a bit of fresh North European blood, as has happened in the past, but changed absolutely fundamentally by the settlement here, and the eventual integration into our society by inter-marriage, of large numbers of people of wholly different cultures and — let us not mince words — *racial genes*? Is it a question of importance that many among future generations of British citizens will not only look vastly different from us but also have fundamentally different thought processes, emotions, characters and mores — that they will, if the process of integration proceeds as intended by our governing classes, turn us into a nation not recognisable as that which our ancestors knew and were loyal to? In short, does it matter?

Well, yes it does actually. And if to state this is 'racist', so be it. We should not duck hither and thither in order to escape the label. This is not to say that we should go out of our way to use it ourselves; it is never sound politics to define what you are in terms of your enemy's language. But neither should we be so frightened of the word 'racist' that we suffer paralysis when it comes to stating why we want to preserve ourselves according to the model of the ancestral type.

Just as belittling others is bad manners,

particularly in their presence, so also is boasting. We British pride ourselves on not being a boastful people. But it is one thing not constantly to proclaim our virtues and achievements to the world; it is another thing entirely not to believe in them. And if really pushed on the matter — if forced into a corner where our existence is threatened and we must explain, not just to outsiders but even to our own folk, why we must defend it — we should not be afraid to state frankly and clearly that we British are a race of truly remarkable accomplishments, accomplishments equal to any others and immeasurably greater than most.



## EMPIRE

This picture, of a kind fashionable in Victorian times, shows a white officer and native troops of the 7th Bengal Infantry. Today we may argue about the ethics involved in British rule over India's hundreds of millions; what we cannot dispute is the fact. The British Empire was an immense achievement by a remarkable people.

From a group of islands off the North West coast of Europe comprising quite a tiny part of the earth's surface, we expanded and spread over five continents eventually to control something like a quarter of that same surface — quite aside from the United States of America, which was founded essentially by our own forefathers, whatever separate path it subsequently took.

It is not the place here to argue whether this control, this domination, was right or wrong, good or bad, mostly beneficent or mostly maleficent — though a strong case could be made for the former. We should simply concern ourselves with the achievement itself. It was possibly the most stupendous achievement in the history of mankind.

No less stupendous were the constructive works carried out over these vast areas once the initial control had been acquired: the founding of great states, the establishment of advanced civilisations, the taming of wilder-

nesses, the prudent administration of regions larger than Europe itself, the building of railways, bridges, dams, cities and a host of other amenities which enormously enhanced the lives of those living in or by them.

And we should not forget the military and naval actions fought, where necessary, to acquire and later defend this enormous estate. Again, we are not here in the realm of ethics, of justice or injustice; it is not our remit in this study to debate the morality of this process. We are simply looking at it as a token of *achievement* — the achievement, for instance, of barely more than a hundred British troops in seeing off an attack by thousands of Zulus at

Rorke's Drift, of just a few regiments in sustaining British rule over hundreds of millions in former India.

Is it unreasonable to believe that these achievements establish our claim to be a people endowed with special qualities — qualities which we may not choose to shout about but over which we quietly allow our deeds to speak for us, while ensuring that the blood lines that made for them in the past are conserved for the future?

## OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS

And mention of these things covers only a fraction of the impact made by Britons on this planet. We might add to them the unsurpassed contributions to technology and science, to medicine, to human inventiveness, to the development of modern industry, to culture and the arts — with literature and the theatre in the forefront. There is not the space here to

Contd. overleaf



## ON THE MEANING OF BRITISHNESS

(Contd. from prev. page)


reel off the lists of the legions of our people — together with those overseas of British stock — who have led the world in these endeavours. They are there on record, however, and readers will be able to find them. Here we are in an area of knowledge which not even liberals and multi-racialists try to dispute. The sum total of the contributions to human progress of the folk indigenous to these islands, and of their descendants in the new lands they have created, is so immense as to be beyond serious challenge. It is equalled possibly by the Germans but by no others, and is certainly excelled by no-one. To the extent that Americans — *white* Americans, that is — have shared in this vast achievement over the short span of their history, that is something which we may quite truthfully attribute to the British and German genes which mainly prevail among them.

Yet the whole case against 'racism' — which case dominates all permitted debate in present national and world councils and shelters behind a virtual closed shop in the press and other media — rests on a repudiation of these basic facts concerning human accomplishment. It rests, in other words, on the supposition that Hottentots, Papuans or Cherokee Indians might just as easily have placed themselves in the forefront of all this creativity and progress but for some mere accident — or perhaps the brutal oppression of their white masters, which prevented them from realising their full potential — an explanation which conveniently ignores the question of how the latter came to be masters in the first place, instead of subjects.

So we come back to the theme of 'Britishness', of what it means to be British. Do not our island story, and our accompanying imperial story, provide ample explanation when such matters are raised? Are we not justified in regarding ourselves as a special people? This, incidentally, is precisely how the Jews and Japanese regard themselves, and it is no purpose of mine here to blame them for that; a sense of 'specialness' is part of the essential survival mechanism of races and nationalities, particularly those perceiving themselves to be under threat. It is valuable even when it is not justified by history; it is all the more so when it is, because being vested with credibility. My only quarrel is with those Jews who insist on their own 'special' status while denying such a thing to others — as is habitual today.

### DEBATABLE ATTRIBUTES

I have excluded from this study any reference to the particular moral virtues on which many Britons pride themselves, and especially I have excluded reference to the British political culture which is so often cited as an example of what our people have given to the world. I exclude such abstractions as 'toler-



**We are apt to forget today that British inventive genius, enterprise and sweat created the original Industrial Revolution, as symbolised by this 19th century ironworks. Though successive governments have allowed our manufacturing power to atrophy on the altar of 'free trade', the qualities that made for our former industrial supremacy are still there, as shown in the extraordinary number of outstanding technical inventions that are the product of British brains. A sense of 'Britishness' should incorporate pride in our unique industrial achievements.**

ance', 'fair play', and the like. This is not because these things do not count in an assessment of a people's qualities, but only because what constitutes them is highly debatable and rather depends on the way one looks at history. They also appear different to people with different ethnic perspectives. Today's Iraqis or Serbs, for instance, might challenge the theory of moral virtue, of a sense of 'fair play', invested in the British who have sanctioned the bombing of their towns and the killing of their civilians in defence of no discernible British interest; they would not, on the other hand, question that the British, over history, have made an almost matchless impact upon the world. One is a question of opinion, the other of fact. And in this analysis it is always better to stick to fact.

It is not surprising, then, that New Labour and its battalions of political correctness are determined that Britain's past will be an area virtually out of bounds to young people in schools. If our young really learn about the past, they will realise that we have something special to preserve and be proud of — and, not only that, but they will learn that we are a people who could have a great future. This is providing always that we maintain the native stock from which our genius has come. But as long as our younger folk are encouraged to think that sporting skills and 'rap' music are as important attributes as scientific flair, industrial competence and literary talent — as long as their minds are submerged in the moronic 'pop' culture of the late 20th and early 21st centuries, and they are not taught anything about Rorke's Drift, Waterloo and Trafalgar, about Newton, Faraday, Davy and Cockerill — they will not know what to say when asked the question: "What does being British mean to you?"

Being British, as I hope I have explained, means being an heir to a great and glorious national heritage, a heritage of immense achievement in almost all fields of human activity, a heritage which has virtually no rivals — certainly not among the peoples newly settled here and now claiming this country as their own.

Precisely because one British characteristic is that of reticence, most of us do not make a habit of trumpeting this repetitively and to all and sundry. Also, because another such characteristic (at least traditionally if not always evident today) is good manners, most of us are loath when speaking to other races to talk up our own virtues by comparison with theirs.

But there sometimes come moments in a nation's life when to downplay its achievements, most of all to forget them, is positively dangerous — dangerous to its self-esteem, dangerous to its perception of its own capabilities and dangerous to its awareness of what it must do to protect and preserve itself.

We should not want Britons to descend to the kind of insufferable national bumptiousness experienced by foreigners when some of our football fans, well laced with booze, swagger through their cities. But nor should we be reluctant, when questioned about our feeling of nationality, to explain the real foundations of our pride.

I have long been convinced that our decline during the later part of the 20th century was something which began in the mind, in a kind of self-hypnosis in which a quite silly and self-deprecating view about ourselves replaced a once-supreme national self-confidence.

We have got to rid ourselves of this complex, and a start might be made in reminding ourselves — and some others — of what the world owes to us.

For that is a mighty big debt indeed.



# @NEWS FROM THE NET@

by Jay Lee

## MARXISTS GET OUR MONEY

Some time during 1999 the "Searchlight Educational Trust", registered charity number- 1013880 (run by the left-wing "Searchlight" magazine) received 156,000 pounds of National Lottery money. I phoned the National Lottery Charities Board (NLCB) on 0171 747 5300 for confirmation. It is obliged to give out the details, and duly did so. The money (which is tax-free for a registered charity) is supposed to be used to "Educate, inform and combat racism". This is strange as-

- (1) Racism is illegal. Therefore *Searchlight* is being given large sums of money to combat a particular crime. Isn't that the police's job? And do we not already have a "Racist & violent crime" unit set up by the police?
- (2) No lottery money is meant to go to any political organisation. *Searchlight* is overtly political.
- (3) Is the population of Britain not already subjected to a barrage of pro-multi racial ideas?
- (4) According to Sir Herman Ousley (Former Chairman of the CRE), Whites make up the majority of race-crime victims.
- (5) If the aim of the project is to tackle the crime of racism, then why does *Searchlight* target our democratic law-abiding party with insults?
- (6) *Searchlight* has broken three guidelines of the charity commission:-


# 32 : A charity whose stated purposes include the advancement of education must not overstep the boundary between education and propaganda in providing balanced information designed to enable people to make up their own mind, and providing one-sided information designed to promote a particular point of view.

# 44 : A charity must not provide information which it knows, or ought to know, to be inaccurate, or which has been distorted by selection to support a preconceived position.

# 46 : A charity must not issue material which supports or opposes a particular political party.

The *Searchlight* Educational Trust (SET) and *Searchlight* magazine have the same address, same phone number, same fax number and same key personnel. They are one and the same.

Serious letters of complaint to:-  
Charity commission  
St Alban's House  
57/60 Haymarket  
London SW1Y 4QX



Interesting E-Mail from Mr John Phillips on the South East London website. SUBJECT Stephen Lawrence:-

"I didn't know Stephen but I did know his brother Stuart, who went to the same college as Stephen, and I can't say I was too impressed. I worked at Woolwich college at the same time as both of them were there, and even though I don't remember Stephen, I do remember that no white student could use the "student hall" in that place. An atmosphere of racist intimidation kept all non-negroes out. An exclusively black "No Whites Allowed" (NWA) area. In all the years I was there I never once saw a white person in that hall; it was a no-go area for all non-negroes, I imagine it is still like that. Stuart Lawrence and Stephen Lawrence used that hall, Stuart and Stephen Lawrence may or may not have been active racists and bullies, but they certainly ENJOYED THE FRUITS OF BLACK RACISM, BLACK BULLYING AND INTIMIDATION".

**Comment:** Back in November 1999 when Stephen Lawrence's pal, Duwayne Brooks was arrested for rape it was barely mentioned in the news. When one of the "Lawrence five" was arrested for burglary it made national headlines. **Wot, no hidden agenda?**

## THE YELLOW PERIL

Australian immigration figures from 1960 to 1997: Non-white, mainly Oriental, Asian immigration began after the end of the Second World War (sound familiar?).

1960 105,887 total immigrants. % which were Asian = 2%

1970 185,099 total immigrants. % which were Asian = 9.1%

1980 80,748 total immigrants. % which were Asian = 32.9%

1990 121,227 total immigrants. % which were Asian = 45.8%

1997 85,752 total immigrants. % which were Asian = 43.7%

Asian immigration is presently running at 60% of the total influx (Which is without the "other" category. This includes Kosovars, Blacks, Arabs, Indians, Lebanese, Gypsies, etc, etc. Sound familiar?) European White immigration is running at only 25% of the total.

In 1888 there were only 3 million people in Australia. Today it has grown to over 18 million.

In 1966 there were only 50,000 Asians in Australia.

By 1991 it had risen to 1.25 million.

By 1995 there were 1.6 million.

By 1998 there were over 2 million.

It has been estimated that by 2020 there will be over 26.7% of the population who are either part or of full Asian descent.

By 2090 Asians are expected to be 66.7% of the population (This is only three or four generations away). **Sound familiar?**

SOURCE: "Australian bureau of statistics"

## PENSIVE PENSIONERS

According to the Office National Statistics (No.1 Drummond Gate, Pimlico, London SW1V 2QQ, Telephone 020 7533 6262, if you're interested in statistical data) by 1999 there were nearly 19 million people aged 50 and over, a third of the population. People aged 50+ has doubled this century. From one seventh in 1901, to one third today. By 2021 the estimate is that one twentieth will be aged 80 or over. People are also living longer, with the number of very elderly (aged 100+) increasing from about 200 in 1950 to 6,000 today. Projections expect this number to rise to about 39,000 by 2036.

Nearly three quarters of women aged 85+ living in private households live by themselves. 43% of unemployed men aged 60-64 had been unemployed for three years or more.

The number of elderly people who want to stay part of the community by becoming involved in voluntary work has increased year on year since 1991. **A party pensioners circle?**



# NATIONALISM

Vs.

# GLOBALISM

*Below is the text, slightly abridged, of a speech made by US presidential candidate Pat Buchanan to the Boston World Affairs Council in Boston, Massachusetts, on January 6th this year.*

Five years ago, historian Christopher Lasch published *The Revolt of the Elites*. It was a book about how our national élite was literally seceding from America. Pointing up the huge and growing gap in incomes between the élite and the middle class, Lasch argued that a more ominous gap existed in how each perceived America.

The old élite, Lasch wrote, had a sense of obligation to country and community. But the new ruling class, more merit-based, brainy and mobile, congregates on the coasts and puts patriotism far down the list in its hierarchy of values. Indeed, said Lasch, "it is a question of whether they think of themselves as Americans at all."

Lasch did not name names, but the new élite is not difficult to identify. A few years ago, Ralph Nader wrote to the executives of 100 giant US corporations, suggesting how they might show their loyalty to "the country that bred them, built them, subsidised them and defended them." At the annual stockholders' meeting, Ralph said, why not begin with a pledge of allegiance to the flag?


Only one company responded favourably. Half did not respond at all. Many sent back angry letters declaring that they were not American companies at all. Motorola denounced the request as "political and nationalistic." Other companies likened the idea of a pledge of allegiance to loyalty oaths of the McCarthy era. Why were the heads of these corporations outraged? Because for years they have been trying to sever their bonds to the country of their birth.

In 1997 the head of Boeing told one interviewer he would be delighted if, in twenty years hence, no-one thought of Boeing as an American company. "My goal," said Phil Condit, "is to rid [Boeing] of its image as an American group."

## 'Beholden to no nation'

Back in the 1970s, Carl Gerstacker of Dow envisioned a day when Dow would be free of America. "I have long

dreamed," he said, "of buying an island owned by no nation and of establishing the world headquarters of the Dow Company on the truly neutral ground of such an island, beholden to no nation or society." A spokesman for Union Carbide agreed: "It is not proper for an international corporation to put the welfare of any country in which it does business above that of any other." In any test of loyalties, for such as these, the company comes before the country.



## PAT BUCHANAN puts the spotlight on the crucial conflict of the 21st century

Early in the 1970s, Zbigniew Brzezinski, later Jimmy Carter's national security adviser, wrote:-

"A global consciousness is for the first time beginning to manifest itself... we are witnessing the emergence of trans-national élites... composed of international businessmen, scholars, professional men and public officials. The ties of these new élites cut across national boundaries; their perspectives are not confined by national traditions... and their interests are more functional than national."

The one big force that can derail the rise of this new élite, warned Zbig, is the "politically activated masses," whose "nativism could work against the cosmopolitan élites."

Brzezinski knew that the creation of any New World Order would have to proceed by stealth. As Richard Gardner, Carter's ambassador to Italy, wrote in 1974:-

"The 'house of world order' will have to be built from the bottom up. An end run around national sovereignty, eroding it

piece by piece, will accomplish much more than an old fashioned frontal assault."

Advancing on little cat's feet, they have done their work. By 1992 Mr. Clinton could appoint as Deputy Secretary of State his room-mate from Oxford days who openly welcomed the death of nations and the coming of world government. Wrote Strobe Talbott:-

"All countries are basically social arrangements. Within the next hundred years, nationhood as we know it will be obsolete. All states will recognise a single global authority. A phase briefly fashionable in the mid-20th century, citizen of the world, will have assumed real meaning at the end of the 21st."

Last year in Istanbul, Bill Clinton declared himself "a citizen of the world."

This, then, is the millennial struggle that succeeds the Cold War. It is the struggle of patriots of every nation against

a world government where all nations yield up their sovereignty and fade away. It is the struggle of nationalism against globalism, and it will be fought out not only among nations but *within* nations. And the old question Dean Rusk asked in the Vietnam era is relevant anew: **Whose side are you on?**

Last fall, accepting the highest award of the World Federalist Association, the 'Most Trusted man in America' declared his loyalty:-

"... If we are to avoid the eventual catastrophe of world conflict, we must strengthen the United Nations as a first step toward a world government... we Americans will have to yield up some of our sovereignty. That would be a bitter pill. It would take a lot of courage, a lot of faith in the new order."

Indeed it would, Mr. Cronkite.

Walter went on to urge US ratification of the UN Law of the Sea Treaty rejected by Ronald Reagan, of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty rejected by the Senate, and of the Rome Treaty for a permanent



international war crimes tribunal. He urged America to surrender its veto power in the Security Council, and called for a standing UN army to enforce the peace of the world. We now now longer see as through a glass darkly, but face to face, the internationalists' vision of world government.

### New World Order the goal

But the American ship of state has long been shifting course to that destination. In October 1991, President Bush told the UN that a New World Order was America's goal. In 1993, the Clinton White House, in a secret national security directive, declared its intent to put US troops under UN command. When young Americans were killed in an accident over Iraq, Al Gore offered his condolences "to the families of those who died in the service of the United Nations."

In a lame-duck session of Congress in 1994, both parties voted to ensnare the United States in a World Trade Organisation where America gets one vote out of 135, and gives up its right to negotiate reciprocal trade treaties that serve America's national interest.

Under the treaty on global warming Al Gore brought home from Kyoto, the United States must radically slash its use of fossil fuels like oil and coal, while no commensurate cut is demanded in the fossil fuel use of 132 'underdeveloped countries', including China.

Two years ago, a Mr. Bacre Waly Ndiaye of the UN Human Rights Commission came to the US. His mission? Tour US prisons to determine if they are up to UN standards. Mr. Ndiaye interviewed condemned killers on death rows to see if their human rights were being violated.

There is of course something comical in a UN official from a continent where the criminal justice system is still, shall we say, pre-Miranda, ripping the US for its prison system. But the issue behind the Ndiaye tour is deadly serious. For he insists he has the right to investigate our prisons because his UN Commission speaks for 'the world' — an authority higher than the United States, and he claims the 1992 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, signed by President Bush, justifies UN inspections of US prisons.

Last month, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Mary Robinson toured Northern Mexico. Her concern? The US Border Patrol. By heavily patrolling the accessible crossing points, said Mrs. Robinson, our Border Patrol is 'forcing' illegal aliens to take more perilous routes into the United States. It is, presumably, a violation of human rights of people breaking into our country to 'force' them to seek out less safe passages across our borders!



### GLOBALISM MEANS ENDLESS WAR

This burning building in Belgrade was just one product of 78 days of bombing of Yugoslavia carried out by the UN.

It is easy to see where Mary Robinson and her colleagues are heading. They seek a régime where UN bureaucrats from Third World despotisms demand that America open her borders and grant sanctuary to all who wish to settle here. Americans who wish to control their borders will be told that sovereignty is outdated, that our great fertile plains and cities are, compared to Bombay and Lagos, under-populated.

From UN declarations of 'world heritage sites' in the US to putting US troops under UN command, to creation of a UN war crimes tribunal with the power to seize and prosecute US soldiers, we are on the road paved by Bill Clinton when he said that he hopes to leave America tied down in a web of global institutions.

Last month, we learned that the UN tribunal to prosecute war crimes in the Balkans has opened a file on US Air Force pilots. The chickens of globalism are coming home to roost.

### Pretext of 'human rights'

Another milestone was crossed last year when UN Secretary General Kofi Annan asserted that only the Security Council can authorise the international use of force; and a nation's sovereignty no longer protects it from intervention, if the UN determines that human rights are being violated. The Brezhnev Doctrine of Limited Sovereignty has been replaced by the Annan Doctrine.

Upon what meat has this our Caesar fed? The United Nations was not established as a world government, but as a forum for settling disputes. Kofi Annan is not the conscience of mankind; he is a civil servant, an employee of the UN; and

he should begin behaving as such.

But it was not Mr. Ndiaye, Mrs. Robinson or Mr. Annan who announced the death of the nation-state. That was Strobe Talbott, Richard Gardner and those Republicans who have made the global economy a golden calf to fall down before and worship. And the political globalists have their own fifth column of fellow travellers inside the conservative élite.

*Wall Street Journal* editor Robert Bartley has been quoted as declaring that "the nation-state is finished." He calls for an amendment to the Constitution to throw open America's borders to immigration from all over the world. Bartley's vision of America as Global Mall is embraced by the global corporations that advertise in the *Journal* and seek access to an inexhaustible supply of low-wage foreign labour. As British author John Gray writes, America's neo-conservatives have become little more than "ranting evangelists of global capitalism."

Let it be said: Loyalty to the New World Order is disloyalty to the Republic. In nation after nation, the struggle between patriotism and globalism is under way. In England, the Tory Party draws a line in the sand at giving up Britain's Pound. In France, farmers riot to preserve a way of life. In Canada, the fight to preserve the national culture is gaining recruits. In Germany, Gerhard Schroeder makes a political comeback by embracing economic nationalism.

And Mr. Cronkite's talk of world government ushering in world peace notwithstanding, the end of sovereignty means endless war. Trampling on the sovereignty of Yugoslavia, President Clinton

*Contd. overleaf*



## NATIONALISM vs. GLOBALISM

(Contd. from prev. page)

demanding that the Serbs surrender Kosovo and cede domination of their country to NATO. When Belgrade rejected his ultimatum, Mr. Clinton began 78 days of bombing, using as his *casus belli* allegations of Serbian genocide against Kosovar Albanians. We now know there was no genocide. We now know it was Clinton's bombing that spurred the killing. We now know that Clinton's war did not create a 'multi-ethnic democracy', but a vengeful little statelet where Serbs are burned out of their homes for sport.

If ever sovereignty becomes obsolete, we may expect America's involvement in endless wars until, one day, we pay the horrific price in some act of cataclysmic terror on our own soil. For interventionism is the spawning pool of international terror.

Admonishing Russia for her war on Chechnya, Madeline Albright declared: "Killing the innocent does not defeat terror; it feeds terror." Exactly, Mrs. Albright. But that is as true of Serbia as it is of Chechnya.

If we wish to see the future our globalists have in mind, we need only look at the super-state rising in Europe. The nations of the European Union have

ceased to be sovereign. They have given up control of their currencies (*partially correct but not yet so in the case of Britain. Ed.*), their budgets, their borders, and are giving up control of their defence. Britain has been forced to comply with a ruling by the European Court of Human Rights requiring the British Army to accept homosexuals. Earlier, the Court demanded that Britain end corporal punishment in its schools. "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his own country?"

### Fight back

In 1939, in his work *The New World Order*, H.G. Wells wrote: "Countless people... will hate the New World Order... and will die protesting against it... we have to bear in mind the distress of a generation or so of malcontents..."

Well, Mr. Wells, we are your malcontents. But we're not going to die protesting your New World Order; we're going to live fighting it. And Seattle may just prove to be the Boston Tea Party of that New World Order. "I believe globalisation is inevitable," Bill Clinton told Larry King at last year's end. Well, I don't!

My vision of America is of a republic that has recovered every trace of her lost

sovereignty, independence and liberty, a nation that is once again self-reliant in agriculture, in industry and technology, a country that can, if need be, stand alone in the world.

My vision is of a republic, not an empire, a nation that does not go to war unless she is attacked, or her vital interests are imperiled, or her honour is impugned. And when she does go to war, it is only after following a constitutional declaration by the Congress of the United States. We are not imperialists; we are not interventionists; we are not hegemonists; and we are not isolationists. We simply believe in America first, last and always.

And we don't want to be citizens of the world, because we have been granted a higher honour — we are citizens of the United States. Asked on his deathbed to make a toast, John Adams, the great Bostonian, declared: "Independence forever!" That is my vision for America; that is our cause; and it shall prevail!

*It may be of interest to readers to know that this speech, despite its being made by one of the major political figures in the United States and a possible future president, was almost wholly ignored — blacked out — by the major news media throughout the USA, including even the locally published Boston Globe.*

## News from the asylum

AN EDUCATIONAL VIDEO which encourages children to experiment with 'gay' sex "will help save lives," say the makers.

In the film, produced for Avon Health Authority, pupils are told they should experiment with boys and girls "to see who you feel most comfortable with."

The video, distributed to schools across Britain, is claimed to be aimed at reducing suicide and HIV transmission among young 'gays'.

\* \* \*

MARK PELL went to apply for a job as a barman at a hotel in Doncaster. His prospective employer told him he could only be taken on if he got rid of his pony tail. A court ordered the hotel to pay him £566 for "injury to his feelings." Dissatisfied with the size of the award, Mr. Pell said afterwards: "I felt personally violated."

\* \* \*

GRAHAM WARE, of Epsom, Surrey, known by those close to him to be intelligent, well educated, law-abiding, conscientious and honest, applied to join the Metropolitan Police. He was interviewed and rejected. The interviewing panel advised him that, although he was an excellent candidate, he needed to get a bit more experience of life, after which he should re-apply.

Graham saved hard, sold his car to support himself and then went travelling around the world, spending some time in Asia, Australia,

New Zealand, the Middle East and the USA, taking labouring work when necessary to remain solvent.

On his return 18 months later, he re-applied to the Met. He didn't even get as far as an interview, being told that he could not be considered because he had not been resident in the UK for the whole of the past three years!

In the meantime, it has been announced that the nation's largest police force is over 400 short in its recruiting needs.

\* \* \*

THE NURSE'S HOME opposite the General Hospital in Newcastle-upon-Tyne is being renovated, with new kitchens and bathrooms, security doors, double-glazing, new



MARK PELL  
Felt 'violated' because he had been asked to cut off his pony tail

furniture throughout, digital TVs, videos and central heating.

But this is not for the nurses, or even pensioners or the homeless. It is for 500 Albanian refugees, who will get cash in hand from an on-site benefit office. The Albanians will not pay rent, council tax, gas or electricity bills or water rates.

\* \* \*

WHILE we are on the subject of refugees, it has been reported that the average cost of keeping an asylum-seeker in a detention centre is £1,300 a week — nearly as much as putting them up at the Ritz.

A room at London's luxury hotel can be had for £205 a night — less than £20 more.

\* \* \*

KIDS at the Bryn-coch Church of Wales School near Port Talbot were lining up for a photo when the cameraman asked them to smile and say 'cheese'.

But when he came to two Asian pupils, Ruby and Jeevan Hayre, he suggested they say 'chapati' instead.

On hearing of this when the two returned home, their father, Gurmail Hayre, decided that they had been made victims of 'racism' and reported the school and the photographer, Martin Phillips, to the CRE, and also complained to education officials at Neath Port Talbot Council, who are now making enquiries.

At the CRE, a spokesman said: "This is the type of complaint which could result in a prosecution in court under the Race Relations Act."



# What is to be done with the NHS?

THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE is widely regarded as the 'flagship' of the Welfare State; so anyone who raises serious questions about it is apt to be dismissed as a crank or crypto-fascist, especially by those with a vested interest in the dependency culture. The politicians' dilemma is that real improvements in the NHS and the nation's health demand quite radical reforms which would be bitterly opposed by NHS employees exploiting the mass media, popular sentiment, medical soap operas and private fears — all to prevent any worthwhile changes.

Since about 72p in every pound spent on the NHS goes on salaries and wages, there is a very large element of self-interest involved when doctors, nurses and their supporting staffs are constantly clamouring for a bigger NHS budget. Yet the precise relationship between increases in the NHS budget and measurable improvements in public health or treatment outcomes is never allowed to enter the debate; any questions of that nature are dismissed as bureaucratic interference. The doctors and politicians know only too well where they stand in the hierarchy of public esteem.

Even so, recent widely publicised failures and some scandalous incidents have generated a lot of public disquiet and scepticism which politicians and the 'caring' professions can no longer afford to ignore. In particular, the notion that doctors should be left to regulate themselves has been severely jolted by the notorious Shipman case and by public exposures of surgical incompetence. Note for example that, in the Shipman case, no-one saw fit to mention that the two doctors who sign a cremation certificate are paid £41 each; but then most hard-working people would be shocked to discover the scale of extra emoluments received by GPs and consultants for relatively trifling tasks. Remember always that when asked how he finally persuaded the doctors to accept his NHS Bill, Aneurin Bevan said: "I just stuffed their mouths with gold."

## MAIN NEEDS OF REFORM

Serious NHS reform demands a combination of epidemiology (the study of the incidence of diseases in populations), cost-benefit analysis, reliable independent research into treatment outcomes, radical reform of medical education and training, and the diverting of a far greater proportion of the NHS budget to health promotion and disease pre-vention.

So it is absurdly naïve to believe that dazzling demonstrations of surgical technology in TV programmes signify that the only things wrong with the NHS are bureaucracy and lack of money. And

## FRANK KIMBAL JOHNSON calls for some radical new thinking

besides, there is compelling evidence of a great deal of unnecessary surgery and superfluous clinical tests, all of which comes with a staggering price-tag.

The much-vaunted 'clinical freedom' of prescribers also lands the taxpayer with a drugs bill

livelihood of the 'caring' professions and treatment industry; but maintaining a healthy life-style is the primary duty of every individual, and this has to be a founding principle of any so-called National Health Service.

Those feckless individuals who wittingly expose themselves to avoidable disease and injury simply should not expect more sensible people to pick up the bills for treating them; they should therefore look to private health insurance or charitable bodies.

But the most formidable problem facing any NHS reformer will always be the deeply entrenched self-interest of the medical profession, whose members — for all their protestations about bureau-



In today's Health Service there is a huge amount of wastage due to doctors performing tasks that are well within the competence of mature nurses.

exceeding £3 billion a year, and the few timorous attempts to control this expenditure have been effectively thwarted by a combination of medical politics and commercial lobbying.

In addition to rigorous examination of NHS cost-effectiveness, organisation and the 'caring' professions, there must also be a sensible reappraisal of the precise conditions which the NHS should be expected to treat at public expense. These should certainly exclude things like alcoholism, drug-addiction, smoking-related illnesses, obesity, HIV/AIDS (treatment costing over £30,000 per case per year), venereal diseases, infertility in women over 35, self-inflicted injuries and elective abortions. After all, what insurance company would provide comprehensive cover for a person with an obviously reckless life-style — except at a premium no-one but the very rich could afford?

All sentiment aside, disease and treatment are the livelihood of the 'caring' professions and treatment

cracy and their claim to professional dedication — enjoy a freedom of action unknown to any other group supposedly serving the public interest. The extent to which this freedom is being abused has for far too long been concealed by medical soap-operas, slick professional PR and the natural reluctance of politicians to be seen interfering with the sacrosanct doctor-patient relationship. But the chronic diseases

*Cont. overleaf*

Shipman: his case highlighted the tremendous danger of doctors working without supervision.





## WHAT IS TO BE DONE WITH THE N.H.S.?

(Contd. from prev. page)

of the NHS will not respond to the political equivalent of aspirins, tranquilisers and sticking-plasters.

To begin with, we really must challenge the preposterous over-training of doctors who, after some seven years of such training in general medicine and elementary surgery, may choose to specialise for the rest of their working lives in fields where most of this training will never be called upon. For example, who needs seven years of such training to become a psychiatrist, anaesthetist, ophthalmologist, obstetrician or dermatologist? And remember that, according to recent research, at least seven out of ten patients seeing GPs could be adequately diagnosed and treated by a mature registered nurse, given easy recourse to a medical second opinion. In the former Soviet Union — and this may still be the case in present-day Russia — a medical technician performed more cataract-removal operations in a single day than any consultant ophthalmologist in Britain does in a month; and note that we have long

waiting lists for such operations in the NHS. So keep in mind the anecdote about the weary old lady who said to the white-coated experts surrounding her hospital bed: "But are you really doing all this for me or am I doing it for you?"

In relation to each category of illness or injury we must therefore establish a particular form of education and training; and this alone can eliminate most, if not all, of the waiting-list problems we hear so much about. At the same time, it would avoid the quite absurd and scandalous over-reliance on immigrant doctors — a situation for which the General Medical Council is entirely culpable.

### REPLACING THE TREATMENT INDUSTRY

The long and short of all this is that we have to replace the present treatment industry with a genuine National Health Service built on individual self-reliance, wholesome life-styles, adequate public health and hygiene arrangements, environmental protection and promotion of good health as a citizen's first duty. We simply cannot allow ignor-

-ance, mawkish sentiment, professional self-interest, disinformation, commercial interests and political cowardice to undermine the nation's health, and bankrupt its economy in the process.

And the undoubted fact that many NHS staff do a first-class job does not alter the need for radical reform of diagnostic and treatment services; indeed, such reform would enhance these people's skills, improve their morale and remove many serious impediments to their work.

A nationalist movement like the BNP is dedicated to the survival and betterment of our race and nation, so it must take all necessary measures to improve both public and personal health, however strenuously opposed by certain groups who put self-interest above honour and public duty. This does not make us less compassionate than our political opponents, but altogether more honestly and sensibly devoted to improving the lot of our kinfolk.

*The writer of this article, Frank Kimbal Johnson, is a retired NHS management consultant with unrivalled experience in the organisation and management of regional and local health services.*

## A GREAT FIGHTER PASSES ON

Rosine de Bouneville (1916-1999)

The patriotic cause lost a valiant crusader when Rosine de Bouneville, of Liss, Hampshire, died on Boxing Day. She was 83.

Rosine was never a member of the British National Party, and in fact disagreed with some of its policies; she was a very strong Roman Catholic and did not hold with political parties



A younger Rosine. Drawing from the 1940s.

parties of any kind. But she must nevertheless be counted a brave and dedicated nationalist who was admired by all who knew her.

Rosine de Bouneville first came to the fore as one of the leading activists in A.K. Chesterton's League of Empire Loyalists, having

previously been a very disenchanted Conservative. She took part in many of the daring and sometimes dangerous publicity stunts whereby the LEL forced its way into the headlines — dangerous, that is, to the participants because sometimes these involved creating a din of protest at Tory meetings and getting very roughly handled by the stewards — who, when it came to strong-arm tactics, did not believe in sex discrimination.

Rosine took part, with AKC, in the founding of the National Front in 1967 — mainly out of personal loyalty to the LEL leader because, as stated, she did not favour the political party approach. When he resigned in 1971, she left with him. Thereafter and until his death in 1973, she helped him with the Candour League, a group which mainly concentrated on the promotion of the highly informative and respected *Candour* newsletter, which Chesterton had founded some two decades earlier.

After AK passed on, Rosine valiantly endeavoured to keep *Candour* going. Without the enormous writing talents and political astuteness of A.K. Chesterton, this was an uphill struggle. However, Chesterton's memory had somehow to be kept alive and his work continued. *Candour* would republish some of his best articles from the past, but had to find new contributors. Together, they and Rosine managed to keep the newsletter afloat right up to the end of her life, albeit not with the former regularity of publication. Now that she is gone, its future is uncertain.

Regrettably, Rosine never married, but she had an enormous number of friends, all of whom will be filled with sadness at her going.

### Tyndall portrait for sale



Some British National Party supporters have got together to produce and market a framed portrait of the party's founder and *Spearhead* editor John Tyndall (shown above). Mr. Tyndall himself neither initiated nor has taken any part in this project, much though he appreciates the gesture. Copies of the portrait are signed by him personally and also by the artist, Anthony Payne.

The price per copy is £40.00 (post-free) UK only. Please make cheques or POs out to 'Save Our Sterling', and send orders to PO Box 56, Bexleyheath, Kent DA7 6ZQ. In accordance with Mr. Tyndall's wishes, all profits will go to the BNP.

### Listen to nationalist radio!

Send large SAE for broadcast details to:  
LIFE RUNE BOOKS, BCM Box 6089,  
London WC1N 3XX

Internet: [www.natvan.com](http://www.natvan.com) & [www.natall.com](http://www.natall.com)



AT THE BEGINNING of the First World War in August 1914, Ireland, which had been formally incorporated into the United Kingdom in the year 1800 and thenceforth governed from Westminster, was on the verge of being granted self-government in Home Affairs. Despite fervent opposition from the Tory Party and the House of Lords, the Home Rule Bill was about to become law.

Yet the Anglo-Irish and Scots-Irish protestant population in six of the nine counties of the northern province of Ulster, who were represented by the Ulster Unionist Council, demanded to be allowed to opt out of the all-Ireland Home Rule dispensation. They had a strong sense of British identity and believed they should not be forced into being represented by an anglophobic and predominantly catholic parliament in Dublin. The Anglo- and Scots-Irish of Ulster wanted to preserve their ties with the British mainland, were loyal to King, country and Empire, and felt that their destiny lay with Britain. Furthermore, they were armed and equipped to fight the Irish Nationalists who did not recognise their right to opt out.

But as Ireland drifted towards war, a temporary truce was called when the World War began. Britain along with Ireland went to war with Germany. And it was because of the sacrifices made by the loyalist Irish of Ulster (and some loyal Southerners) during the course of the Great War that the British Prime Minister, Asquith, guaranteed that Ulster would not be forced into an all-Ireland state when the Home Rule Bill eventually became law. This obviously meant that Ireland would become partitioned.

The casualties during the Great War were, as everyone should know, colossal. On just two days alone, the 1st and 2nd July 1916, 5,500 Ulstermen perished in the Battle of the Somme. And it was in that same year that Irish republicans mutinied. The Easter Rising occurred in Dublin. Two Ulster catholic republicans ordered the Central Post Office in the city to be occupied by republican insurrectionists with the co-operation of German secret agents. British troops put down the rebellion firmly and the ringleaders were hanged. But the latter were regarded as martyrs by most of the catholic Irish people, and from that moment, Irish republican sentiment spread pandemically throughout catholic Ireland.

## Republican gains

When the Great War ended, a general election ensued. The Irish Republican party Sinn Fein made sweeping gains at the expense of moderate nationalists, capturing 73 seats at Westminster. But in the six counties of Ulster, where pro-British protestants formed two thirds of the population, the Ulster Unionist Tories won 23 seats and the moderate nationalists only four. The political division between Ulster and the rest

# The Origins of Northern Ireland

(Part 2)

## JOHN GRAHAM supplies some facts to combat popular ignorance

of Ireland was thus very stark. Almost everywhere outside Ulster was republican, but in Ulster it was predominantly unionist.

The Irish republicans not only wanted Ireland to end its link with Great Britain; they also refused to recognise the right of the six counties of Ulster to remain part of the United Kingdom after independence had been achieved. By now, internecine war was taking place between Irish republicans and British security forces in the South of Ireland.



### THE EASTER UPRISING

In 1916, Irish republicans took advantage of Britain being at war in Europe and staged an insurrection in Dublin. This was a classical example of the 'stab-in-the-back' strategy. Britain — unlike now — retaliated with the use of overwhelming force and put the insurrectionists down, hanging their leaders. Above is a scene at the barricades.

At the post-war conference at Versailles in 1919, a Sinn Fein delegation was present and supplicated the conference to recognise an all-Ireland republic. The Sinn Feiners were assuming the right to govern all of Ireland prior to any such right being granted by the British Government, which still legally had sovereignty over that country. The Ulster Unionists had long since accepted that most of Ireland would become independent but steadfastly championed the right of six of the nine counties of Ulster to remain in the United Kingdom.

It seemed very probable that the aspir-

ations of the Unionists would be granted, even though the Home Rule Bill, passed before the Great War had begun (but still in a state of suspension), had not allowed for an Ulster opt-out. The former British Prime Minister, Asquith, had already given his pledge to Ulster, and three senior members of the Ulster Unionist Council had been in the British War Cabinet, namely Sir Edward Carson, Sir James Craig and Lord Londonderry. Conversely, Lloyd George, the new Prime Minister, declared the self-proclaimed parliament of Republican Ireland (*Dail Eireann*) illegal. It was the leaders of this illegal parliament which had co-operated in the mutiny of 1916 with German assistance. The British Government would not therefore be amenable to ditching the Ulster loyalists to comply with the wishes of these republicans — and quite rightly not.

## Special Constabulary

In 1920 the civil war between Irish republicans and British forces spread from the South of Ireland into Ulster. Thus in September of that year Lloyd George founded the **Ulster Special Constabulary**. Despite its name, this body was more akin to the Home Guard as it was known in Britain during World War II. This Special Constabulary was established to defend the province of Ulster. There were to be three categories

of special constables: **A Specials**, a full-time paid force of 2,000 in number and a supplement to the Royal Irish Constabulary; **B Specials**, a part-time unpaid force numbering 19,500, wherein recruits were to serve in the areas where they lived; finally **C Specials**, like the B Specials, an unpaid force of unspecified size, but only for call-up in dire emergencies.

Recruitment to the Ulster Special Constabulary was confined to six of the nine counties of Ulster. The founding of this supplementary force was clearly a preamble

*Contd. overleaf*



## THE ORIGINS OF NORTHERN IRELAND

(Contd. from prev. page)

to the partitioning off of the six counties from the rest of Ireland.

Three months later, in December 1920, the British Government introduced the **Better Government of Ireland Act**. This was the Act that partitioned Ireland. The 26 counties of the remainder of Ireland became known formally as **Southern Ireland** (though they included one county, Donegal, that was in the far north west). Southern Ireland was granted a parliament with autonomy in home affairs. The six counties of the North of Ireland became known formally as **Northern Ireland**. This would also have a home rule parliament. Ireland would thus have two separate parliaments in this newly partitioned country. But Southern and Northern Ireland were to continue to be represented in the British Parliament at Westminster as before, though of course Westminster's sphere of competence in Ireland's affairs would be considerably curtailed. Foreign, Commonwealth and Dominion matters for the UK would be still common to all parts of the kingdom.

This Government of Ireland Act also established a Council for All Ireland wherein matters pertaining to the whole of Ireland, North and South, would be debated by the executives of both Irish parliaments. This council was envisaged by the treaty-makers to be an inchoate government for all Ireland. But in 1925 it was rescinded because of opposition from the Northern Ireland Government.

### Bulwark against the South

It is ironic that the Ulster Unionists, who had fought against Irish Home Rule for decades, ended up with Home Rule themselves, albeit confined just to certain internal affairs. But there was an important reason why Northern Ireland's Unionist leaders countenanced this. A Northern Ireland Parliament would be Unionist-dominated. Having a Northern Ireland Parliament with a permanent Unionist majority was an important bulwark against any possible future attempt by a Westminster Government to force Northern Ireland into an all-Ireland state. The Northern Ireland prime minister could simply say 'no' to Westminster and point out — correctly — that his veto had a democratic mandate of the people behind it, whereas beforehand no such constitutional veto had existed. The British Government before the First World War had tried to force the six counties into an independent Ireland at the point of a gun. Such treason from Westminster had made the loyalist Irish of Ulster very embittered against British Government and suspicious of its intentions — not without good reason, as subsequent history has proved.

But there was some advantage in the

system from Westminster's point of view: a Northern Ireland Government would free it from the day-to-day problems of governing the province. This was a further reason for a Home Rule Government for Northern Ireland.

The Better Government of Ireland Act came into force in May 1921. In that month the first-ever elections to the Northern Ireland Parliament took place. These were on a constituency basis and a form of proportional representation was used.

There were to be 52 parliamentary seats in the Lower Chamber. The elected government would appoint members of an Upper House called the Senate. The parliamentary government of Northern Ireland was officially under the aegis of the Northern Ireland Governor General, who was appointed by the Crown.

The result of this first Northern Ireland election was as follows: Ulster Unionists 40 seats; Irish Nationalists six seats; Sinn Féin six seats. This was obtained on an 89 per cent turnout.

So the Ulster Unionists won with a huge majority, taking nearly 80 per cent of the seats. Northern Ireland's first prime minister was Sir James Craig. Craig gave up a senior ministerial post at Westminster to take up the premiership. He duly appointed a Cabinet. The leader of the Ulster Unionist Council, Sir Edward Carson, not an Ulsterman, had decided to retire from the political scene and hand the leadership over to Craig (the Ulster Unionist Council had changed its name to Ulster Unionist Party prior to the elections).

A month after this election, on June 22nd, the King (then George V) visited Belfast and proclaimed the state opening of the Northern Ireland Parliament in the City Hall. For the next ten years this was where the parliament met. Then in 1932 a new parliament building was opened by the Prince of Wales. This was Stormont Castle, just outside Belfast.

The six Irish Nationalist members of the new parliament and the six elected on behalf of Sinn Féin refused to attend this state opening.

The Better Government of Ireland Act of 1920 had thus brought about Northern Ireland devolution. In addition to the 52 deputies elected to the parliament in Belfast, Northern Ireland was represented by a modest twelve MPs in the UK Parliament at Westminster. Devolution for Northern Ireland occurred some 77 years before Scottish and Welsh devolution, and its origins were very different. It was the pressure from Scottish and Welsh *nationalists* which gave the impetus for parliaments to be established (or re-established) in



### STORMONT

The eventual setting for the Northern Ireland Parliament, opened in 1932

their two parts of the kingdom. By contrast, it was the impetus from Ulster *unionists* which gave rise to the Northern Ireland Parliament. As indicated earlier, the latter was regarded as a political citadel by unionists to *prevent* the expulsion of Northern Ireland from the UK by the British Government at the behest of Irish republicans.

But the opening of the Northern Ireland Parliament was by no means the denouement; war still continued between the British and Irish republican forces. The latter rejected the Better Government of Ireland Act. They wanted full independence, not Home Rule. Furthermore, they insisted upon an all-Ireland state. In other words, they did not recognise Northern Ireland as having any right to exist; so fighting continued.

### Truce

In January 1921, however, there was a truce between the IRA and the British Government. Talks began between *Dail Eireann* and Westminster. The result of these was the **Anglo-Irish Treaty** on the 6th December 1921. This Treaty set aside the Better Government of Ireland Act for Southern Ireland. Indeed the name Southern Ireland was dropped, and that of the **Irish Free State** replaced it. By provision of the Treaty, the Irish Free State was granted political independence from Britain, though it still remained in the British Empire and Commonwealth. Its status *vis-a-vis* Britain became akin to that of Canada. In return, the Irish signatories agreed to recognise the border between the Free State and Northern Ireland — subject to there being a Boundary Commission enquiry into possible future alterations of that border. The Irish delegation signed the Treaty only with the greatest reluctance. Many republicans regarded it as a 'sell-out'. However, *Dail Eireann* approved it by a vote of 66 to 57.

But the IRA was determined to destabilise Northern Ireland with the intention of bringing the province to its knees so as to



make it vulnerable to annexation by the Irish Free State. As soon as the *Dail* had approved the Anglo-Irish Treaty on January 7th 1922, an IRA campaign of terrorism in Northern Ireland began. This brought about enormous civil unrest between republican and unionist communities in the province, especially Belfast. In the midst of this civil unrest, the Civil Authorities Bill was introduced by the Northern Ireland Government. This gave the authorities emergency powers of arrest of suspects, detention and punishment. In May, 200 Catholics were interned. During the summer there was a border foray in Co. Fermanagh as the IRA attempted to force a revision of the border. Several hundred troops were pressed into action.

By the autumn, the situation in Northern Ireland had quietened down as civil war in the Irish Free State broke out between the moderate nationalists and the republicans. This came about when in London an IRA gunman murdered Sir Henry Wilson, military adviser to the Northern Ireland Government. The British Government's threat of military action in response to this murder forced the Government of the Irish Free State to crack down on the terrorist elements, and this action sparked off the civil conflict. The IRA in Northern Ireland decided to obey the Free State's command not to wage war with the Northern Ireland security forces, so civil unrest abated in the province as war raged south of the border.

Between July 1920 and July 1922, when the six counties struggled to remain in the United Kingdom, the death toll in the province was: 303 Catholic civilians; 172 Protestant civilians; and 82 members of the security forces. In addition to this, there were thousands of evictions from both homes and jobs. A Unionist MP had also been murdered in Belfast and businesses had been destroyed by vandalism.

## Boundary Commission

But the long struggle of the loyalist Irish of the six counties of Ulster to secure their British citizenship was won — or almost. The Irish Free State still held on to its irredentist claim to annex the province. And it was in this respect that Northern Ireland had one more Beacher's Brook to overcome. This was the investigation by the Boundary Commission into possible changes in the border with the Free State.

This Boundary Commission enquiry was, as stated, one of the conditions of the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921. In the Treaty, only minor revisions of the border were stipulated — if indeed there were to be any at all. These revisions were to take into account the wishes of the people who would be affected by them, and also the general interests of the countries on both sides of the border.

Yet such considerations could mean almost anything! For example, the two Northern Ireland counties of Fermanagh and

Tyrone contained populations that were more than half Catholic. Irish republicans no doubt believed that on such a reckoning these two counties should be allocated to the Free State in their entirety, even if large minorities of the populations were Unionist. In fact, it was probably with this ambition regarding the border revision that the republicans who were parties to the Treaty agreed to sign it.

If the Boundary Commission were to take the same view as the Irish republicans it would mean that the number of counties in Northern Ireland would be reduced to four. This would render the province conspicuously diminutive and thus seeming not to viable on any permanent basis, contiguous as it was with its irredentist neighbour. It was therefore reckoned to be only a matter of time before Northern Ireland would become incorporated into the Irish Free State.

The Northern Ireland Government, together with the loyalist Irish Protestants in the province, had forebodings of this very outcome of course, just as much as the Irish republicans hoped for it. Northern Ireland's survival as a British province was still very much perceived to be in grave jeopardy. Large-scale border revisions were something that Northern Ireland had to fight against at all costs. It is necessary to add also that the six counties were a definite political entity, with their own government and even their own flag (the flag of Ulster is a St. George's flag with a red hand containing a star in the centre). The Northern Ireland Government was exceedingly reluctant to yield up a single inch of the province's territory.

In November 1924, the Boundary Commissioners convened. There were representatives from the British Government, the Irish Free State Government and the Northern Ireland Government, as well as an impartial commissioner from South Africa. These representatives were to travel the whole length of the border to make their observations. The project would take a number of months to complete. A report would then be prepared and published. Whether both parliaments of the two Irelands would accept this report remained to be seen.

Tension mounted during 1925 as the commissioners undertook their work. The Northern Ireland Government mobilised the B Specials and the C Specials of the Ulster Constabulary in case of war. In April 1925, Prime Minister Craig called an election. The results were: Ulster Unionists 40 seats (again); Irish Nationalists 10 seats; and Sinn Féin two seats. The Unionist vote in the border regions was in fact higher than in the previous election of 1921.

Then one week before the Boundary Commission's report was due to be published, details of it were leaked by a civil servant, and a map of the proposed border appeared in a newspaper. A broken line on the map showed how the border was inten-

ded to be altered. Part of South Armagh, a Northern Ireland border county, was to be transferred to the Free State. Small areas of Southern Fermanagh, another Northern Ireland border county, were likewise to be transferred, as were tracts of Western Tyrone. But a strip of Eastern Donegal was to be re-assigned from the Free State to Northern Ireland. No border towns were to be transferred. These proposed boundary changes were in fact comparatively minor, as the Anglo-Irish Treaty had envisaged they would be.

## Northern Ireland preserved

When the Government of the Free State received news of the leaked map, its members were dismayed — even though the Free State was to make a net gain from the changes. What disturbed the Free State Government was that the changes would not be anything like large enough to undermine the viability of Northern Ireland as a British province.

A senior official from the Free State urged the British Government not to publish the report. The reason was that if it were published the Free State Government would be bound by the Treaty to accept its recommendations; but this would be tantamount to endorsing the continued political partition of Ireland, which the Free State was not prepared to do.

The Northern Ireland Government did not want the proposed border changes to be implemented either. Northern Ireland territory would be annexed by the country's hostile neighbour.

Consequently, since neither government countenanced the recommendations of the Boundary Commissioners, the report never saw the light of day — there being a quiet consensus of agreement not to publish it, and the border has remained the same to this day.

The importance of the investigation of the Boundary Commissioners, and the subsequent suppression of their report, is that it brings an end to the chapter of the history of Northern Ireland's origins as a UK province of a partitioned Ireland. For the first time in our (the UK's) history, there was a land frontier between ourselves and a foreign country. This foreign country had an irredentist claim on a British province. It was, and still is, the function of this province to defend this frontier.

---

## EDITOR'S NOTE

*Particularly pertinent in this article are the writer's references to the huge sacrifices made by loyal Ulstermen in war for Britain. Considering these, it is utterly shameful that so-called 'British' governments have in recent years been anxious to sell the Ulster people out to the Irish Republic. Spearhead and the British National Party have steadfastly defended Ulster's cause over the years and will continue ever to do so.*



# TWO SIDES TO A QUESTION

IAN BUCKLEY examines a book which takes a new look at an old fable

**Anti-Semitism: The Longest Hatred** (by Robert Wistrich). Methuen.

Robert Wistrich wrote the above work at the suggestion of Simon Wiesenthal, and its publication was partly financed by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Though only of moderate length, the book is highly detailed, attempting to cover the history of 'anti-semitism' from the ancient Egyptian alleged anti-semitic propagandist Manetho — who wrote over 2,300 years ago — to the present day.

*The Longest Hatred* is not, of course the first book I have read on the subject with which it deals. When I began the study of this subject years ago, my sympathies were initially with the allegedly persecuted Jews. Later it dawned on me that this strange tale of 'persecution' was capable of more than one interpretation. As Rabbi Edgar Magnin once remarked: "The fools don't realise that the more you tell Gentiles that nobody likes us the more they'll say there must be a reason for it."

To paraphrase Oscar Wilde, to be persecuted once is a misfortune, but to be persecuted throughout history begins to look like carelessness. It comes as a shock to realise that the famous orator Cicero protested all those years ago against the dangers of increasing semitic influence in the Roman Senate.

## Not all one-way

Unlike other books written from the Zionist perspective, this one by Wistrich doesn't deny the fact that 'persecution', whether in ancient or modern times, certainly wasn't all one way:-

"Justinian's oppressive legislation provoked the Jews to take their revenge on Christians at Caesarea in AD 556, and at the beginning of the seventh century to kill many Christians in Antioch. They aided the Persian invaders in bringing about the fall of Byzantine Jerusalem in AD 614, helping them to lay waste to Christian homes and churches."

Wistrich is excellent in providing an intelligent simplification of complex ideas. Describing the views of the 19th century French philosophers, he says that:-

"The Semitic deity of the Old

Testament was depicted in the spirit of Voltaire as a murderous, hypocritical and exploiting Moloch-God who devoured his children and encouraged the cult of human sacrifice. This blood-lust which biblical Judaism had transmitted to Christianity found its culmination in the wage-slavery of modern capitalism over the 'Aryan' love of nature, respect for the family and pagan ideals of beauty, harmony, liberty and fraternity."

Wistrich himself admits that 'anti-semitism' is a poor term, since it is never applied to a dislike or fear of Arab influence. Even more absurdly, the followers of the appropriately named Rabbi Avi Kook believe that all secular Jews are 'anti-semites'! So apparently almost everyone is an 'anti-semite' — with the possible exception of Tony Blair, who has just toddled along behind Jonathan Sacks to yet another 'Holocaust' conference. *Au contraire*, I note with interest that Blair did not even bother to reply to a recent letter from leading churchmen in the North East of England protesting about the closure of the very last mine in Co. Durham — all that's left of an industry that one employed a quarter of a million.

At that 'Holocaust' conference, Chief Rabbi Sacks once again

announced his loathing of 'racism', a statement which I'm sure must be of great comfort to the oppressed and persecuted Palestinians of Israel. Here we reach the crux of the matter: top Zionists like Sacks preach the gospel of fanatical ethnic loyalty to their own people, whilst with equal fanaticism promoting the exact opposite for everyone else. Could any Southern US 'redneck' or Afrikaner come even close to the racial hatred demonstrated by Edwina Currie's father when he held a funeral service for his daughter on the occasion of her marriage to one of the *Goyim*?

Wistrich admits that this attitude of intense exclusivity is the cause of much 'anti-semitism', but naturally denies that the 'Chosen People' concept embraced by his own folk is based on racial hatred of Gentiles. He does, however, confess that the *Talmud* contains some anti-Christian passages — a welcome admission, even if such a statement is analogous to calling the Grand Canyon a hole in the ground.

## Old socialists not so kosher

Wistrich demonstrates how gloriously politically incorrect early British socialists were:

"They would have agreed with the Labour leader Keir Hardie that



MARGARET THATCHER

Her type of Conservatism was seen as congruent with the values of British Jews.

'modern imperialism is run by half a dozen financial houses, many of them Jewish', or with the TUC resolution of September 1900 which condemned the Boer War as 'designed to secure the gold-fields of South Africa for cosmopolitan Jews, most of whom have no patriotism and no country.'"

Wistrich believes that Weimar Germany and post-1965 America represent cultural and political peaks for World Jewry. To the rest of us, both seem like societies of decadence and twilight, of appeal only to asset-strippers and crazed ethno-masochists.

Tawdry Thatcher's smash-and-grab years are also singled for praise with the following revealing comments:-

"Indeed, never before had the prevailing ethos and values of most middle-class British Jews seemed so congruent with those of the new-style Conservatism. Politically, this was reflected in the prominence of Jewish ministers like Sir Keith Joseph, Leon Brittan, Nigel Lawson and others in Mrs. Thatcher's Cabinets during the 1980s, and in the support which she found in the teachings of Chief Rabbi Jakobovits. Mrs. Thatcher's support for



BLAIR

Very keen to get in on the 'Holocaust' industry; less concerned about the fate of abandoned Durham miners.



Jewish causes (especially that of Soviet Jewry), her friendliness towards Israel and her espousal of traditional Jewish values such as a close family life, self-reliance, hard work and individual initiative was undoubtedly appreciated by many British Jews."

A different view of the period was given by an honourable Goy expelled from that Cabinet, Sir Ian Gilmour, who wrote in his book about those years, *Dancing with Dogma*:-

"London was almost like a third-world capital. The only thing missing were the rickshaws. The growth of poverty was blatant... children's diets deteriorated, their average height stopped increasing, more children were homeless, more of them were ill, and improvements in infant mortality slowed down."

Perceptions do differ — a truism which applies as much to the question of 'anti-semitism' as to any other. Although Robert Wistrich tries to maintain an ob-

jective tone, his partiality comes out particularly in relation to the Middle East. Palestinians are 'terrorists' while Jews are 'freedom fighters', who 'execute' British soldiers and police. Similarly, revisionist historians like David Irving propagate 'wicked myths', but Israeli atrocities against Arabs are either grossly exaggerated or non-existent. Naturally, no mention is made of the complete destruction of 400 out of 500 Palestinian villages in 1948, or of the massacre at Deir Yassin.

### Foreboding

Later in the chapter devoted to Britain, Wistrich strikes a foreboding note, as though he realises that such an obvious and blatant accumulation of Jewish power as presently exists will bring about an inevitable backlash:-

"In the eyes of militant British nationalists Jews are indeed responsible for the racial tensions in

English society and represent the occult, international power that governs world affairs. But even in more respectable middle-of-the-road British opinion there exists a latent strain of anti-semitism which feels uneasy at Jewish influence in politics, business, the media and cultural life, which finds Jewish particularism distasteful and bristles at the alleged dual loyalties of Anglo-Jewry towards Israel."

Horrible us for harbouring such unreasonable thoughts! Seriously though, what is notable in the foregoing quote is that the author, who wrote his reference book with the help of Wiesenthal, the Hebrew University and the American Jewish Committee, only employs one 'alleged' in the whole paragraph. A revealing confession direct from the horse's mouth!

Karl Marx, of all people, in *The Jewish Question* (1844), warned that Judaism — in his opinion a religion of money, chicanery and

commercialism — was dominating, subverting and wrecking the entire Western Christian world. In the looming hell-hole of the global market, we can see that this prophecy is coming true. But Gentiles as well as Jews are equally implicated, and crude anti-semitism merely plays into the hands of the Zionist overlords. Taken overall, Wistrich's book is a devastating Jewish self-indictment, though probably not in the way the author intends.

### From one of their own

"Since the late 1960s, there has developed a kind of Holocaust industry, which has made a cult of the Nazi Holocaust. And the purpose of this industry is, in my view, ethnic aggrandisement — in particular, to deflect criticism of the State of Israel and to deflect criticism of Jews generally."

PROF. NORMAN FINKELSTEIN  
(University of New York)

# "WE HAVE WAYS OF SHUTTING YOU UP!"

READING the *Jewish Chronicle* is always instructive. Obtaining my copy in my local newsagents is slightly embarrassing: people of 'the faith' are numerous in my neighbourhood and when I step up to the counter to pay there are often one or two of them queuing for the same purpose. As they observe what I am buying, and then examine my person, I can just imagine them muttering to themselves: "He doesn't look like one of us!" One gentleman with a rather rabbinical appearance once made so bold as to ask, with

doubt in his eyes: "Are you Jewish?" I replied negatively, of course. It then occurred to me to add, mischievously: "I just believe in keeping an eye on them."

I could see the man's face crease into a frown, so thinking "In for a penny, in for a pound," I went on to say: "You know, this is where you get a lot of the real news — the sort you don't read in the ordinary press."

I recalled that remark last month when wondering how the fraternity in question were going to react to the rise of Jeorg Haider in Austria. Actually, I myself have some reservations about Haider. Anyone who looks so like Tony Blair has to be treated with a certain amount of circumspection. Also, Haider has been making a number of apologies lately — for instance for daring once to say something complimentary

about Hitler's employment policies. Well, what's wrong with that? Whatever may be said against *Der Führer* in other respects, the fact is that he *did* put 6 million jobless Germans back to work in very quick time. I believe anyway that politicians are almost always wrong to apologise, and Herr Haider did not go up in my estimation on that account.

**Some people, says JAMES THURGOOD, are all for democracy as long as it's just working for them**


But of course, it is always the *perception* of what a politician is, rather than the reality, that determines attitudes towards him. Haider is perceived, rightly or wrongly, as some kind of neo-nazi monster. Hence my curiosity.

The way Haider's success was greeted in the *Jewish Chronicle* was of great interest to me — but more because of what it told me about the writers in that paper and their attitudes than what was said about Haider himself.

The *JC* was in a not-unaccustomed dilemma. The paper, of course, stands for the loftiest principles of 'democracy'. But has not Haider risen to his present powerful position in Austrian politics by the democratic vote of the people? You see the problem!

The *JC* leader (4th February) spoke first about the very rapid manner in which the other member states of the European Union

Contd. overleaf



Haider: Reaction to his rise shows 'liberal' hypocrisy at its worst.



## "WE HAVE WAYS OF SHUTTING YOU UP!"

(Contd. from prev. page)

agreement as to what their response was to be to the prospect of the Haider party having places in the Austrian Government. "They served notice," it said, "that any role for Mr. Haider's party would prompt them drastically to downgrade ties with Austria. This would, among other things, involve shelving bilateral exchanges with the Austrians, curtailing political contacts with Austrian envoys in EU states, and refusing to back Austrian candidates for posts in international organisations."

To which the ordinary rational person would no doubt react by saying: "So what?" It is doubtful that great numbers of Austrians will be applying at their chemist's shops for additional sleeping tablets on those accounts. But we should read a little further.

Generally approving this Europe-wide reaction, the *JC* also admitted its snags, acknowledging that it might make Mr. Haider yet more popular at home. Yet, the leader continued:-

"This does not mean the outside world should abruptly change course, abandon its position of principle and take a softly-softly approach. It does mean that the underlying principle must be patiently, publicly and articulately explained. The aim — it must be made clear — is not to seek to exclude Austria and its people from the EU or the world family of nations, nor to question the right of voters to choose who governs them. It is to define bedrock tenets with which the world community hopes to build a 21st century on lessons learned from the bigotry and murder that too often marked the 20th. To the extent Austria chooses to include in its government a party rooted in an opposing vision of both the past and the future, to continue business as usual would be illogical, and immoral."

## STING IN THE TAIL

You have to be something of a *JC*-watcher — which I might extend by saying a watcher of the entire liberal, New World Order-oriented press — to see the not immediately clear message here. It lies in the last two lines, and the operative word is 'business'. This, I suspect, means much more than just business in the diplomatic sphere — cross-border contacts, appointments to international offices, etc. It looks very much as if it could mean actual trade and commerce. Is the *Jewish Chronicle* leader giving the first hints of a planned economic boycott?

To get a clue as to the answer to that question, we might turn to an article on Page 31 of the same issue by John Diamond, who was much more explicit.

Mr. Diamond, of course, believes too in the democratic freedoms — well, almost but not quite. There is, you see, democracy and democracy; it all depends for whom. He is, he begins by saying, "... a fully paid-up member of the freedom-of-speech brigade." He continues: "I spent my formative political years telling anyone who would listen that it was Voltaire who cracked the one about disagreeing with what you say but defending to the death your right to say it."

But, he goes on...

"... then along comes little Austria, a paid-up member of the European Union, and announces that its equivalent of the Conservative Party is in an uncomfortable colloquy with its ultra-right-wing Freedom Party, with the result that any day now the erstwhile annexe to the Fatherland might once again have N\*\*\*s in government. OK: they're not National Socialists in the scientific sense, perhaps, but when you have a party which talks about Aryans, immigrants and bloodied soil in the way some in the Freedom Party do, it's hardly worth splitting hairs."

By now, Mr. Diamond is clearly anticipating some people disagreeing with his drift. He has prepared for that; he has an answer:-

"But hold on, say the other side: what about democracy? If Georg Haider's chums go into the government or even, God forbid, run the government, it will be as a result of the democratic will of the Austrian people. Equally, Austria was elected into the EU by what passes for democracy in that institution. We can't just kick them out because we don't like the people they elect to power."

Now Mr. Diamond is really in full flow, and the reader can almost predict what's coming next. He does not disappoint:-

"It's perceived to be the same argument that we liberals use when we

say that, much as we despise the British National Party, we regard its right to erect websites, hold bring-and-buy coffee mornings and publish maniacal brochures about how the Jews control the world as inviolable. But it's not the same argument at all."

Why isn't it? — the reader will naturally begin to ask. But that reader obviously is not aware that people like Mr. Diamond make the rules in these matters — or at least that is their presumption. Homosexuals, even paedophiles, may use the net. So may the spokesmen for the IRA and other terrorist groups; you will not find the John Diamonds objecting to this. All sorts of organisations, in addition to this, may publish tracts claiming that such-and-such control the world: Catholics, Freemasons, Jehovah's Witnesses and little green men from Mars. No problem! That's the freedom that Voltaire talked about, and Mr. Diamond stoutly defends it. As he said, he's a fully paid-up member of the freedom-of-speech brigade.

But when it comes to saying critical things about Mr. Diamond's own people, that's different. You see the point?

## 'DEALING' WITH THOSE AUSTRIANS

All this is building up to the most important thing that Mr. Diamond wants to say. He has obviously been wrestling in his mind with the question of how to say it, because he is aware of its contradictions. He believes in democracy, as we have seen; but on the other hand *some* democracy, for *some* people, just can't be allowed. So what are we to do about Austria and Haider? Mr. Diamond has the answer:-

"... within the non-bellicose bounds of international diplomacy, we have a limited armoury with which to deal with a party led by a professed admirer of some of Hitler's policies. We have no right to stop Haider saying such things, but we can say, in effect to Austria:-

"Elect whatever government you choose — that's your prerogative. But, equally, it's our prerogative to stop trading with you, going to your ski-runs, sending you our ambassadors or generally treating you like civilised people. It's your loss, and the practical loss will be greater than whatever gain you perceive there to be in sending a few Turkish or East European immigrants home. Come back when you've decided to stop being silly."

"This is the way to deal with the nastier by-products of free speech. It shouldn't, for instance, be necessary to pass laws to stop right-wing fanatics from saying that evil Jews are taking over the world. Simply make sure publishers know that, if they want to sell such nonsense to true believers, they'll have problems selling other books to the rest of us. Don't like a fascist website? There are plenty of suppliers of Net facilities to the fascists who would lose out if the rest of us stopped using their services."

Here, spelled out in as frank terms as we could wish for, is Mr. Diamond's idea of how 'democracy' should work. It will be noted that nowhere does he suggest that the arguments of people he thinks are wrong should be countered in open and honest debate and proved, by superior argument, to be fallacious. That, to most of us, is what democracy has meant across the ages. But to Mr. Diamond? Oh no! In the eyes of him and his ilk, it means something entirely different.

To him and his ilk, democracy means the right to suppress the views of people you don't like by threats and intimidation — mainly economic intimidation. Boycott their industries for a start! In Austria a big industry is tourism. Very well, let's not visit their ski-slopes. Where does this lead us? Shall we refuse to buy recordings made by the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra? Shall we refuse even to listen to Mozart, Haydn, Schubert or Strauss? After all, Mr. Diamond has suggested that we should not treat the Austrians — out of whose ranks have come these immortal geniuses — like "civilised people."

And extending the issue beyond Austria, it is clear that Mr. Diamond believes that Internet suppliers who hire facilities to those of whose politics he disapproves should simply be closed down — not by an act of law (that would be too blatant) — but by ruining them by boycott. Booksellers and publishers? Same treatment! Make sure hardly anyone buys their books and they'll fold up. Business is business!

This then seems to be the ideal of democracy believed in by Mr. Diamond — and many like him. Perhaps it's all part of the "bedrock tenets with which the world community hopes to build the 21st century." We cannot say we haven't been told!



# Great Midlands rally

SATURDAY, the 29th January, saw the first of this year's BNP Midlands rallies as well as the first of the new millennium.

Bursting at the seams, the Black Country venue held 108 people. The meeting was well chaired by Peter Baker, who is also very active within the party's Media Monitoring Group. Whilst conducting proceedings professionally, Pete, as he is known to do, managed to inject a little dry humour during the course of the afternoon, putting everyone at ease.

The hosts, Steve and Sharron Edwards, were first on the platform. Sharron gave a short address which she began by addressing her new position as BNP deputy leader and acknowledging the challenges ahead. She highlighted the fact that these tasks could be surmounted, as the BNP proved to be capable of doing so many times in the past. Sharron also stressed the significance of the great achievements made at both the general and Euro elections, and how, combined with the increase in candidates in local elections, the BNP political vehicle would again reach its destination via the electoral highway.

Steve Edwards, West Midlands Regional Organiser and next to speak, enthused everyone with his commentary on community politics. Outlining his dealings with the local community and authorities, he spoke about the endless waste of taxpayers' money by the Labour-controlled Council, in particular the £1 million grant for a Bangladeshi-only health centre and the authorities' latest gaffe in piloting an 'anti-racism awareness course' for which the only literature available was in every language but English. Steve also spoke briefly about some other issues, such as the plan to promote homosexuality in schools by Section 28.

## BIG ELECTION OPPORTUNITY

Many of the members present cheered Steve's positive efforts for the BNP, and he nearly brought the house down with some of his personal observations. As one member put it, "Steve was on top form." Steve is the party's candidate for the Tipton Green ward in this year's local government elections, and the seat he is contesting will be in the spotlight as he received 17.5 per cent of the vote last year. This year there is a real chance of him winning.

Next on the agenda were reports from branch and group organisers from all over the region. Andrew Hall, who gave the report from Hereford & Worcester, also spoke about the great efforts and enthusiasm of the former organiser and long-standing nationalist Walter Carr, and expressed how much an inspiration Walter had been to him. At the end of this tribute, the audience gave Andrew and Walter a standing ovation. If the region's reports are



Richard Edmonds explains a point. Seated on right is Frank Forte.

anything to go by, the BNP in the West Midlands is really thriving.

Andrew was followed by the ever-enthusiastic Frank Forte, who encouraged everyone to "take a chance" once in a while to the betterment of the BNP, not to leave things to the next person but to do whatever is necessary ourselves. He also talked about bringing more women into the BNP and stressed their importance, particularly when introducing new people to the party. He related a story about how his own wife during the course of her daily duties talks to many people; once she builds up a rapport, she is then able to bring the BNP into the conversation, proving that, as we are all ambassadors of the party, women


are often more adept at dealing with people.

The main speaker was Richard Edmonds, who was his usual vibrant self. Richard spoke about an article he had read in a newspaper describing the demise of Detroit, in the USA, a city famous for motor manufacturing, like Birmingham. He spoke about how property was being sold off for next to nothing in the American city as a result of 'white flight' to the outer suburbs, and said that just the same thing was happening in Britain. At this point, a member of the audience who came from the North East of England interjected and confirmed that properties were being sold off in his part of the country for a mere 50p each(!) and were being eagerly snapped up by Asians — something verified by a recent newspaper report. Richard finished his speech to rapturous applause.

Finally, Frank Forte closed the meeting with a 'Dutch auction' collection appeal, which raised the fantastic figure of £1,095.33 — thanks largely to one contributor who put in £600. The West Midlands BNP will now be able to realise its ambition to buy the latest model in digital printers, which will make it self-sufficient in leaflet production.

To sum up the rally, we take a quote from one of the local members who, having recently joined as a result of the Euro Elections, described it as "a most uplifting experience."

**TYNDALL IN WEST MIDLANDS:** John Tyndall will be the main speaker at the St. George's Day rally staged by the West Midlands BNP on April 22nd. Contact Steve Edwards for details.




*Identity* is the newly launched official magazine of the British National Party. With 28 glossy pages and a full-colour cover, plus articles on a wide range of topics, *Identity* is a showcase for modern nationalism and a 'must' for dedicated activists and curious sympathisers alike.

Issue number one includes: Home and Overseas news; BNP objectives for the year ahead; White settlers in prehistoric America; book reviews; the launch of the Association of British ex-servicemen, and much, much more.

The cover price of *Identity* is £1.95, but all readers of *Spearhead* can obtain their sample copies for a specially reduced post-inclusive price of just £2.00. Please make cheques or Postal Orders payable to 'Identity', and send to PO Box 44, Bexleyheath, Kent, DA7 6ZS.

PO Box  
44,  
Bexleyheath,  
Kent, DA7  
6ZS  
Tel-  
ephone:  
07979  
417 677





RACE  
AND  
NATION



The Editor  
'Spearhead'  
c/o PO Box 117,  
Welling,  
Kent DA16 3DW

SIR: In September 1930, Cynthia Mosley, first wife of Sir Oswald Mosley, visited Leon Trotsky at Prinkipo. At the time, both Sir Oswald and his wife were Labour MPs. Lady Mosley was to die about three years following her meeting with Trotsky. Prior to the meeting, she had written the following letter to Trotsky:-

"Dear Comrade Trotsky,  
"I would like above all things to see you for a few moments. There is no good reason why you should see me as: (1) I belong to the Labour Party in England, who were so ridiculous and refused to allow you in, but I also belong to the ILP, and we did our very best to make them change their minds; and (2) I am the daughter of Lord Curzon, who was Minister for Foreign Affairs in London when you were (the equivalent) in Russia! On the other hand, I am an ardent socialist. I am a member of the House of Commons. I think less than nothing of the present Government. I have just finished reading your life, which inspired me as no other book has done for ages. I am a great admirer of yours. These days, when great men seem so very few and far between, it would be a great privilege to meet one of the enduring figures of our age, and I do hope with all my heart you will grant that privilege. I need hardly say I come as a private person, not a journalist or anything but myself — I am on my way to Russia, leave for Batum — Tiflis — Rostov — Kharkov and Moscow by boat Monday. I have come to Prinkipo this afternoon especially to try to see you, but if it were not convenient I could come out any day till Monday. I do hope, however, you could allow me a few moments this afternoon.

Yours fraternally  
Cynthia Mosley

Assuming the sincerity of Lady Mosley's gushings, one wonders how far Sir Oswald would have endorsed them at that time. The first Lady Mosley (Cynthia) had non-western blood in her veins — which might explain why Trotsky attracted her. I think the letter should be of some interest to British Nationalists, as it was widely believed at the time that Mosley controlled Lady Cynthia's thinking and that she always took her cue from him.

My information comes from *Trotsky's Writings on Britain* (volume three).  
(Fr.) JOHN DOCHERTY  
Newton Abbot, Devon

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The reader of the quoted letter may find some confusion in Lady Mosley's statement in one part that she is on her way to Russia and in a later part that

she is already in the town where Trotsky is living! Possibly, her political judgement was all of a piece with this.)

SIR: A recent edition of *Natural World* magazine included an article by one Judy Ling Wong deploring the fact that activities relating to the British countryside and wildlife are still seen as no-go areas for "the energy and talents of ethnic communities." The article went on to say that "urban flora and fauna are intrinsically multi-cultural," and that "multi-cultural interpretation of the environment in areas where there are no resident ethnic groups is also part of the picture, since all of the country, and not just the inner cities, is home to ethnic people." The article concluded with the statement that "a sea change in how we view people, nature and landscape is long overdue," and it demanded "action now to put right the history of neglect and exclusion of ethnic minorities... within the positive atmosphere(?) created by the Lawrence Inquiry."

I have yet to be persuaded that Mis Wong is not an escapee from Peter Simple's column in the *Daily Telegraph*, but meanwhile I feel obliged to comment on the inclusion of such an article in *Natural World*. This publication is laudably concerned to promote all necessary measures to safeguard the natural environment and protect endangered flora and fauna. For example, it includes articles applauding measures to preserve field crickets, the grey seal and digger wasps from extinction, and a piece by the Wildlife Trust's Director General deplores the impact of intensive agriculture and unprecedented development pressures on this country's wildlife.

Am I the only person to see a profound contradiction, not to say hypocrisy, in this magazine's alleged concern with preserving the British wildlife and habitat and its simultaneous espousal of multi-racialism? Are we to accept that the desire of the native British to maintain their identity uncontested within their own homeland is trivial, if not downright repugnant, when compared with the fate of the red squirrel, natterjack toad and digger wasp? Are we not to enjoy our native habitat without threat of dispossession by alien intruders? Or must we regard the presence of these intruders as entirely natural and characteristic features of the British countryside — along with elephants and zebras perhaps?  
FRANK KIMBAL JOHNSON  
Louth, Lincs.

SIR: Isn't it about time that *Spearhead* did an educational run to explain to the people of this country that an all-out attack is taking place against them? Let us also explain to the Christians who are left amongst us that the advanced nations of the West are Christian and that massed immigration from the Third World, including the Islamic World, is going to destroy Christianity here.

It has always been well known that before you can take over a country it first has to be destabilised. Are we not now witnessing this? And is it not obvious to all that the mass media are helping the

process?

Let us remember that America, which was founded by white pioneers, is now being taken over by massed immigration.  
E. ANDREWS  
Bristol

SIR: A friend of my daughter, a long-term army officer stationed in Kosovo, has written that the conditions under which the troops in his regiment are serving are simply insupportable. They are disliked by both sides in the conflict, by one for having interfered in the first place and by the other for keeping them from the throats of their hereditary foes!

This officer is aware that his and his men's whole mission is political. The directions given them are worse than useless — in fact he says they could be called *misdirections*. His men ask him why the refugees, from this and other parts of the world, are provided with comfortable, and at times even luxurious, accommodation on arriving in Britain, while they, in the front line supposedly serving the country, have to suffer these appalling conditions in a cause which none of them understands and are supposedly due to the fact that the government "has no money." By all accounts though, there is plenty of money for the asylum-seekers!

The officer has served 14 years in the army, is keen on his profession, proud of his regiment and its men, and is willing to undertake dangerous assignments if they serve some national good and are properly backed up by the government of the day. Here it is quite the contrary. Now, on top of all this, there is the scheme to allow buggery in the forces, which he is certain is intended to destroy the last vestige of excellence in the army — as it undoubtedly will.

T.D. FOSTER  
Edgware, Middlesex

SIR: What a fantastic country ours must be! People are now hi-jacking aircraft to get here. It's only our brain-dead government that's falling for it. Everyone else can see what a trick the whole thing is.

Free housing, cash benefits, no need to work. Fabulous!

Give them a few weeks and they'll get what they want. Then they'll start to demand this, insist on that and need the other. And eventually we'll have to build them more mosques — possibly on the sites of churches or schools, which will be closed down by local authorities just to provide the space.

IVAN BURROWS  
Sheffield

SIR: If Jack Straw has such a low opinion of the English, why does he not get away from us all and take a holiday? Somewhere in the Middle East might be appropriate, as there's just a chance that he might discover a little more about his ancestral roots. As for the English 'violence' of which he speaks, he'd find plenty of that in Israel!  
BRIAN PHILLIPS  
Orpington, Kent



# PUBLICITY MATERIAL

Except where otherwise stated, the items listed below should be ordered from PO Box 287, Waltham Cross, Herts. EN8 8ZU

## BNP PUBLICATIONS

### For a Britain Strong and Free

Attractive pamphlet in full colour prepared especially to deal with enquiries from the 1999 Euro



Election and now serving as the main introductory publication for the BNP. **£1.26 post-free.**

### Britain Reborn

British National Party Manifesto for the 1997 General Election. In 64 large pages, it examines all the problems facing Britain today, and sets out the BNP policies which will meet the challenges ahead. **£3.55 post-free.**

### Freedom for Britain and the British

The British National Party's Manifesto for the 1999 Euro Election. 24 pages long, it covers all the key areas in which EU membership is undermining Britain's traditional freedoms. **£2.00 post-free.**

### No to Maastricht! No to Europe!

Booklet outlining the British National Party case against the EC and in particular against the Maastricht Treaty. Produced by BNP Devon Branch in collaboration with party headquarters. **60p post-free.**

### The Enemy Within

Exposes the role of the BBC as a weapon of mass brainwashing. The booklet comprises the text of an official complaint by the party to the Broadcasting Complaints Commission. **44p post-free.**

### BNP Activists' Handbook

This handbook is a comprehensive instruction course in all the essential techniques needed in promoting and building the British National Party at local branch level, starting from scratch when the activist is entirely alone. This booklet is a mine of information that all activists, old and new, will find valuable in the quest to make their activities more efficient and effective. It is a 'must' for everyone who wants to be more than just an armchair nationalist. The Handbook is illustrated and runs to 71 pages. **£2.00 post-free.**

### Spreading the Word

A handbook on propaganda designed to supplement the Activists' Handbook. Illustrated, *Spreading the Word* runs to 60 pages and contains five sections:- (1) General Principles of Propaganda; (2) Recruitment; (3) Canvassing for Elections; (4) Speaking to the Media; and (5) Speaking from the platform and presentation of Party meetings. Special attention is also given to dealing with enemy smears -- valuable for this alone. **£2.00 post-free.**

## BNP LEAFLETS

**The Full Monty:** Exposes Tony Blair's unbelievable recommendation that skilled men thrown out of work by New Labour's Tory globalist economic policies should retrain as strippers! Even more arrogant than Norman Tebbit's infamous 'On your bike' comment, this dis-

gusting suggestion has given the BNP a leaflet which can be used to devastating effect in Labour's old industrial heartlands.

**Do you think?** Hard-hitting leaflet dealing with the flood of bogus refugees and Kosovar Muslim asylum-seekers now bringing social services in many parts of the country to the point of collapse.

**Conservative? Not any more!** Aimed especially at disillusioned Tory voters and activists, and particularly useful in the constituencies of Tory MPs who attack the BNP. Exposes the liberalism and perversion which riddles the Conservatives.

**Stop the building!** Calls for a halt to the planned destruction of the green belt by up to five million new houses. Exposes immigration as the main motor of the threat to our countryside.

**The leaflets above are all two-coloured, double-sided and cost £8 per 1,000, with postage charges of £5.95 for 1,000 and £6.45 for 2,000.**

Other publicity items in stock are the headline-grabbing A4 anti-paedophile leaflet **Stop Labour's attack on the welfare state, Defend British Fishermen, and British Countrymen**, the BNP newsletter produced especially for country people. Call 07774 454893 for details.

**Regular leafleting is the key to increased recruitment. These are first class propaganda weapons. Use them to build the British Resistance!**

## BNP VIDEO RECORDINGS

**Rally November '97:** Video of the second BNP rally of the year. Excellent regional reports, plus stirring speeches from Richard Edmonds, Nick Griffin and John Tyndall.

**Rally January '97:** Video of the postponed 1996 BNP Annual Rally, held in London on January 25th 1997. Speeches by Dr. Donald Stevens, Nick Griffin, Richard Edmonds, John Tyndall and overseas guest José Ramos.

**Rally '95:** Video of the BNP Annual Rally, staged in London on November 11th 1995. Hear and see speeches by John Morse, Richard Edmonds, Thomas Andersson, Michael Newland, Dr. William Pierce and John Tyndall.

**Videos of Rallies '95-'97 cost £15.92 each post-free.**

**Rally '94:** Video of the BNP Annual Rally, staged near London on November 5th 1994. Speeches by David Bruce, Richard Edmonds, Gunther Deckert, Claude Cornilleau, Michael Newland and John Tyndall. **£13.02 post-free.**

## Build the BNP — read and sell... The Voice of Freedom

The monthly newspaper of the British National Party is packed with news and facts the controlled media don't want you to know about. Its subjects range from anti-white racism to the destruction of Britain's economic and political independence. Every issue brings you shocking reports of events hushed up by the mainstream news media.

But it's not just a matter of knocking the other parties. *TVOF* also sets out in plain, simple language how the BNP would deal with the problems facing Britain.

*The Voice of Freedom* is tabloid-size and has 12 pages, with plenty of illustrations.

Don't miss a single issue. Order now!

**Send three first-class stamps for sample copy and subscription details and write to: PO Box 1032, Ilford, Essex IG1 1DY.**

## THE KEY TO GROWTH

While it is personal contact which makes most enquirers commit themselves to the BNP, the best way to find those enquirers in the first place, and to generate local press interest, is through regular leafleting. All BNP units, and even isolated members, should aim for a leaflet drop at least once a week.



Essential to the BNP's success is the ability to attract attention. This is done by the use of large, eye-catching leaflets. These are distributed in the most effective way possible, ensuring that they are seen by as many people as possible. The leaflets are designed to be simple and direct, with a clear message. They are also easy to handle and distribute. The BNP's success is due to the use of these leaflets, which are a key part of its publicity strategy.

**East London council elections 'Vote BNP' video. Includes the uncut General Election broadcast. 17 minutes of ground-breaking publicity material. £6.50 incl. p&p.**

## BNP AUDIO TAPES

**BEST-SELLING TAPE!** Two recorded talks by John Tyndall: *The BNP: a movement for the new century.* An exposition of the main BNP policies; *Time for action!* A summons to the lazy and the apathetic to stir themselves and get involved! **£6.00 plus 36p p&p.**

## ALLIED PUBLICATIONS

### THE TRUTH AT LAST

Hard-hitting tabloid for American and other White Race patriots. *The Truth at Last* is not a BNP publication but the topics are most enlightening, covered as they are with total freedom of speech and frankness. Send £5 note for trial 6-month subscription to *The Truth at Last*, PO Box 1211, Marietta, Georgia 30061, U.S.A.

### FREE SPEECH

Written transcripts of the regular radio broadcasts made by Dr. William L. Pierce of the American National Alliance. Of interest to white people all over the world. Appears monthly. Send US\$5.00 for sample copy. Subscription rates to the UK supplied on request. Please send US currency only. Write to PO Box 330, Hillsboro, WV 24946, U.S.A.

**British National Party lapel badges:** These are temporarily out of stock. The party is re-ordering, and they should be available very soon. Watch this page for further information.



**AGRICOLA AND GERMANIA (Tacitus). £6.99.** The great Roman historian describes our Celtic and German ancestors in about 100 AD. Two books in one volume. This ed. 1970, 175pp.

**AMERICA'S DECLINE: THE EDUCATION OF A CONSERVATIVE (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £4.50.** A collection of articles and reviews on various aspects of the collapse of modern civilisation. 1981, 375pp.

**... AND THE TRUTH SHALL SET YOU FREE (David Icke) £13.50.** A very individual and controversial study of the global financial and political elite. 1995, 474pp.

**ANGLO-SAXONS, THE (Ed. Campbell) £15.00.** A handsome, well-illustrated book covering the history of England and the culture of its people from the 4th to 11th centuries. With leftist teachers and curriculum advisers doing all they can to undermine knowledge of, and pride in, our ancestors among the younger generation, it is important that nationalists get books like this into the hands of their growing children. 1982 (rep. 1991), 272pp.

**APOCALYPSE 1945: THE DESTRUCTION OF DRESDEN (David Irving) £15.00.** An updated version of the 1963 account of this real 'war crime' — the allied terror bombing of an undefended city, packed with refugees fleeing from rape and murder at the hands of the brutal Red Army. 1995, xiv, 315pp.

**ARTHUR'S BRITAIN (Leslie Alcock) £9.99.** Convincing picture of life between the 4th and 7th centuries, when Celtic Britain was abandoned by the Roman Legions to the Picts, Scots and Anglo-Saxons. 1971 (rep. 1989), 437pp.

**BABYLONIAN WOE, THE (David Astle) £17.00.** A study of the origin of certain financial practices and their effects on the events of ancient history, written in the light of the present day. 1975, 250pp.

**BEGINNINGS OF ENGLISH HISTORY, THE (Dorothy Whitelock) £6.99.** Describes Anglo-Saxon culture and organisation and relations with the Celts between the leaving of the Romans and the coming of the Normans. 1952 (this ed. 1991), 256pp.

**BELL CURVE, THE (Richard J. Herrnstein & Charles Murray) £25.00.** This important book, which has aroused enormous controversy in the USA, deals with differences in intellectual capacity among people and groups. The ways in which these could be accounted for by environmental influences are examined, and accorded the remarkably small amount of weight they deserve. 1994, xxvi, 845pp.

**BLAIR'S BRITAIN (Hal Colebatch) £7.95.** The threat posed by the present cultural establishment, supported by the Labour Government, to our national identity. Highly recommended. 1999, 158pp.

**BRITAIN'S FUTURE: THE MEANING OF THE MAASTRICHT TREATY (Prof. Stephen Bush) £1.25.** A strong plea for British independence from the EC bureaucracy. 1990 (rep. 1993), 24pp.

**BRITISH ISLES, THE (Hugh Kearney) £7.95.** Subtitled 'A history of four nations', this is an outline of British history by an academic historian stressing the role of the non-English parts of the British Isles. 1989, 324pp.

**CALL IT CONSPIRACY (Larry Abraham) £14.00.** Shows how socialism is a product of the wealthy, and how money manipulation has disastrous consequences. 1985, xvii, 325pp.

**CAMP OF THE SAINTS, THE (Jean Raspail) £5.00.** A welcome reissue of this sensational novel about the destruction of the white race by Asian immigrant invasion. Once on sale in ordinary bookshops, but now only available from

*The prices given in this list do not include postal charges, which should be estimated by calculating one eighth the total value of the order, except in the case of overseas orders, where those about to send for books should first enquire. The minimum postage for UK orders is 50p.*

*Payment should be made in sterling only and should be enclosed with all orders. All cheques or postal orders should be made out to 'Freedom Books' only, and should not be included in remittances sent to associated bodies for other items. Orders are likely to be dealt with more quickly if 'Freedom Books' is marked on the envelope. Please send all orders to our mail order address, which is:-*

**Freedom Books  
PO Box 59  
Mold  
Flints. CH7 5ZA**

*New titles are marked with stars ★*

*Please note this fact, which is of great importance: the books sold through Freedom Books are written by many different authors holding a number of different political viewpoints, very few of them being in any way connected with Freedom Books' parent, the British National Party. The party's mail order book service distributes these books because it is felt that they fill important gaps in public information and understanding of vital national and international issues. This does not mean that all the content of the books should be taken as representative of the policies of the party. The party reserves the right to differ with some of the authors over some parts of their writings.*

the nationalist 'underground'. One of the great works of fiction of the second half of the 20th century. 1973, 311pp.

**CASE FOR DAVID IRVING, THE (Nigel Jackson) £12.50.** A study of the organisations and individuals seeking to suppress the historian David Irving's freedom to travel and communicate and of the smear campaign against him. The book relates especially to Mr. Irving's efforts to get into Australia. 1994, xi, 208pp.

**CELTIC MYTHS AND LEGENDS (D.W. Rolleston) £1.99.** The myths and founders of Britain. First published early this century, rep. 1994, 457pp.

**CENSORED HISTORY (Eric Butler) £4.00.** An examination of some of the facts of recent

history that have not found their way into textbooks or newspapers. 1974, 48pp.

**CHURCHILL'S GRAND ALLIANCE (John Charmley) £20.00.** A study of the Anglo-American relationship of 1940-57, showing the disastrous consequences of Churchill's faith in US friendship. 1995, xv, 427pp.

**CHURCHILL'S WAR (David Irving) £16.95.** The highly controversial story of Britain's World War II leader and the conflict in which he was at the centre. 1987, 591pp.

**CHURCHILL, THE END OF GLORY (John Charmley) £30.00.** This massive work follows in the footsteps of David Irving in its raising of awkward questions concerning Churchill as a national leader, though the author is more moderate in his treatment of his subject than is Irving. 1993, 742pp.

**COLLAPSE OF BRITISH POWER, THE (Correlli Barnett) £10.99.** Vitally important book which shows how liberalism and lack of political realism brought about Britain's 20th century decline in the political, industrial and military fields. A classic work by a mainstream historian, more relevant by the year! 643pp.

**COME CLEAN, MR. GABLE (Alexander Baron) £1.50.** Shows how Gerry Gable of *Searchlight* magazine exploits the story of the Stephen Lawrence murder but has used exactly the same sort of violent hoodlums as those who committed it. 1998, seven pp (A4).

**CONSPIRACY OR DEGENERACY? (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £4.00.** Text of a lecture by the author, a brilliant classical scholar, to New England rally for God, Family and Country. 1966, 76pp.

**CONTROVERSY OF ZION, THE (Douglas Reed) £17.75.** A best seller in nationalist circles ever since its publication. A study of Jewish-Gentile relations since biblical times, packed with little known and long suppressed facts. 1979, 580pp.

**CRIMES AND MERCIES (James Bacque) £8.99.** The shocking treatment of German civilians under the allied occupation, 1945-50. The hidden story of the biggest 'ethnic cleansing' in European history. 288pp.


**DEADLIER THAN THE H-BOMB (Leonard Young) £2.00.** Important work on the international money power and its threat to the freedom of nations. The author was a distinguished RAF officer and active nationalist. 1992, 72pp.

**DISCRIMINATE OR BE DAMNED! (John Fairbanks Kerr) £8.25.** An Australian author describes how anti-discrimination legislation in Australia, the UK and the US has resulted in absurdities and injustices. 1995, vii, 126pp.

**DISPOSSESSED MAJORITY, THE (Wilmot Robertson) £15.50.** This book has attracted worldwide attention, dealing as it does with racial problems in America (and not just simply between Blacks and Whites). A comprehensive introduction to the subject very relevant to Britain. 1981, 613pp.

**ELEVENTH HOUR, THE (John Tyndall) Hardback £25.00; paperback £17.50.** Comprehensive statement of the case for modern British Nationalism. A partly autobiographical account of the author's origins, first political stirrings and subsequent work in building up the British National Party. A 'must' for all BNP supporters. First published in 1986, this is an updated edition published in 1998, 537pp.

**EUROPE'S FULL CIRCLE: CORPORATE ÉLITES AND THE NEW FASCISM (Rodney Atkinson) £7.95.** The book argues that the European Union is fascist and corporatist in inspiration. Discusses the Bilderberg Group, the CIA and internationalists like Arnold Toynbee and Joseph Reitlinger. 1996, 149pp.



About the suppression of free speech in so-called 'democratic' Australia (See this page)



**FORCED WAR, THE** (David L. Hoggan) £21.00. Described by Harry Elmer Barnes as "... the first thorough study of responsibility for the causes of the Second World War... the definitive revisionist work on the subject." 1989, 732pp.

**FROM ROME TO MAASTRICHT** (Brian Burkitt, Mark Bainbridge & Stephen Reed) £1.50. A reappraisal of Britain's membership of the European Union. 1992, 69pp.

**GLOBAL TYRANNY, STEP BY STEP** (William F. Jasper) £12.50. How the United Nations is being developed as an omnipotent global government, suppressing national identities and freedoms. 1992, xvii, 350pp.

**GREAT AMERICAN BETRAYAL, THE** (Patrick Buchanan) £15.00. How American sovereignty and social justice are being sacrificed to the gods of the 'global economy'. A powerful plea for national freedom and social justice with great relevance to the UK. 1998, 376pp.

**HATE COMES TO TOWN\*** (Alexander Baron) £1.50. The lies and poison of the *Searchlight* 'Educational' Trust, documented, exposed and deconstructed. 1999, 25pp (A4).

**HEREDITY AND HUMANITY** (Roger Pearson) £9.65. Covers race, eugenics and modern science. A scholarly but eminently readable criticism of egalitarianism by the holder of a PhD in Anthropology. 1996, 162pp.

**HIDDEN MENACE TO WORLD PEACE** (James Gibb Stuart) £10.00. A well-known advocate of monetary reform deals also with secret politics, media censorship and the movement towards a 'New World Order'. 1993, 233pp.

**HOLLYWOOD PARTY** (Kenneth Billingsley) £16.99. The story of the attempted communist takeover of Hollywood in the 1930s and 1940s. The truth about the 'blacklist' and the HUAC hearings. A 'must' for students of media lies. 1998, 365pp.

**IDEOLOGY OF OBSESSION** (David Baker) £35.00. Study of the life and thought of A.K. Chesterton, one of the major figures in British Nationalism from the 1930s to the 1970s. Though not supportive, generally fair. 1996, xiii, 250pp.

**IMPERIUM** (Ulick Varange) £15.00. One of the most important nationalist philosophical books of the post-war period. The author (real name Francis Parker Yockey) rejects Marx, Freud and other 'culture-distorters' and demolishes the whole liberal world outlook. Originally published 1948, 625pp.

**JEWISH HISTORY, JEWISH RELIGION** (Israel Shahak) £11.99. An absolutely vital book by a brave Israeli professor at Jerusalem University. A real eye-opener on Zionism. Paperback.


**KILLING OF THE COUNTRYSIDE, THE** (Graham Harvey) £7.99. A former farming journalist describes the havoc wrought by subsidised 'agri-business' on the environment of rural Britain, on the taxpayers and on the rapidly shrinking number of independent farmers. A truly shocking and important book. Paperback.

**LAST SECRET, THE** (Nicholas Bethell) £7.99. The disgraceful story of how the anti-communist Cossacks were forcibly handed over by the western allies for slaughter by the Soviets between 1944 and 1947.

**LEMMING FOLK, THE** (James Gibb Stuart) £7.95. A witty and factual examination of current attitudes and intellectual fashions that are threatening our future. 1980, 246pp.

**MARCO POLO REPORT** (Institute of Historical Review) £13.00. The extraordinary story of how international pressure groups compelled a popular Japanese magazine to close down after it had published a revisionist article. 1995, 30pp (A4).

**MAN AND TECHNICS** (Oswald Spengler) £3.95. Sub-titled 'A Contribution to a Philosophy of Life', this book argues that the world is governed by natural forces in man and nature, rather than by genteel political and religious creeds. c. 1930, rep. 1992, 73pp.



An excellent exposition of the fruits of decolonisation (see this page)

**MONEY BOMB, THE** (James Gibb Stuart) £4.25. Discusses the failure of our debt-based financial system and describes its role in creating inflation. 1983, 158pp.

**NAMELESS WAR, THE** (Capt. A. Ramsay) £8.00. An outline of the secret history of the events leading up to the Second World War. First published 1952. 128pp.

**NATURAL LAW OF RACE RELATIONS** (Laszlo F. Thomay) £7.50. An examination of racial tensions in a number of areas, showing that they are based not on hate or bigotry but on natural universal laws. 1993, 145pp.

**NEW UNHAPPY LORDS, THE** (A.K. Chesterton) £6.00. An exposure of the financial power that seeks to drag on mankind into a global police state. 1972, 288pp.

**ONE WORLD, READY OR NOT?** (William Greider) £9.99. Subtitled 'The Manic Logic of Global Capitalism', this book demonstrates the threat posed by the global economy to the economies and societies of individual nations by currency transfers and the shifting of production to low-wage countries. A demolition of fashionable economic dogma by a mainstream author. 1997, 582pp.

**PHILOSOPHY OF NATIONALISM, THE** (C.C. Josey) £10.00. Eminent scholar argues that civilisation is based on ethnically homogeneous nations. 1923, rep. 1983, 227pp.

**POPULISM AND ÉLITISM** (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £4.00. A study of the purpose and function of political power and the elements which have wielded it in the 20th century. 1982, 101pp.

**RACE, INTELLIGENCE AND EDUCATION.** 50p. Produced by a group of nationalist teachers in reply to an NUT race-mixing booklet. Packed with facts and cogent argument. 1979, 20pp (A4).

**RACE AND REALITY** (Carlton Putnam) £4.00. A companion volume and supplement to *Race and Reason*, showing how the truth about the race issue has been suppressed by interested parties. 1967 (rep. 1977), 192pp.

**RACE AND REASON** (Carlton Putnam) £4.00. A plain, unemotional account of the race issue that has been an invaluable contribution to the debate for many years. 1961 (rep. 1977), 125pp.

**RACES OF BRITAIN, THE** (John Beddoe) £17.00. A reprint of a scholarly work on the Celts, Anglo-Saxons, Vikings and Normans, with information on related peoples of Europe. 1885 (rep. 1983), vi, 273pp.

**RACE PROBLEMS AND HUMAN PROGRESS** (W.C. George) £4.00. Shows how the racial egalitarian dogma is flawed, despite the influential forces promoting it. 1967, 80pp.

**RESTORATION OF PROPERTY, THE** (Hilaire Belloc) £3.50. Reprint of the 1936 classic by the co-founder of the Distributive movement. Trenchant criticism of both capitalism and communism. 1984, 78pp.

**REVOLUTION FROM THE MIDDLE** (Dr. Samuel Francis) £6.50. Series of incisive essays arguing

that white patriots should adopt insurgent, rather than conservative, strategies to defend their culture and values. Although written for Americans, this book contains many invaluable lessons for British nationalists too. 1997, 250pp.

**ROTTEN HEART OF EUROPE** (Bernard Connolly) £17.50. A former official of the European Commission exposes the lies and deceit involved in the establishment of the ERM and the dangers involved in European monetary union and European federalism. 1995, xviii, 427pp.

**STALIN'S WAR** (Ernst Topich) £13.00. A revisionist view of the origins of World War II by an Austrian professor of philosophy, showing how Stalin incited the war hoping to seize Western Europe in the ensuing chaos. 1987, 152pp.

**STANDBEARERS** £6.00. Subtitled *British Roots of the New Right*, a collection of essays on 20 political and cultural heroes for British nationalists. 1999, 176pp.

**SURVIVAL OF BRITAIN, THE** (Brian N. Monahan) £7.80. A series of articles from the *Social Creditor* dealing with political and economic threats to Britain's survival. 1971, viii, 124pp.

**THE GRIP OF DEATH** (Michael Rowbottom) £15.00. Fine study of modern money, debt slavery and destructive economics. 1998, 337pp.

**THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE** (Brian Burkitt and others) £4.50. A cost-benefit analysis of British membership of the EU and a listing of the alternatives to membership. 1996, 111pp.

**THIS AGE OF CONFLICT** (Ivor Benson) £3.20. An exposure of the illegitimate power structures that exist in today's world. A glimpse 'behind the scenes' of international politics. 1987, 61pp.

**TO RESTRAIN THE RED HORSE: THE URGENT NEED FOR RADICAL ECONOMIC REFORM** (Alan D. Armstrong) £11.95. A businessman discusses the origins of our money system, its social and ecological consequences and proposals for its reform. 1996, 137pp.

**TRAP, THE** (Sir James Goldsmith) £7.99. Enigmatic businessman defends the concept of the nation-state and points out the perils of global free trade, particularly with the Far East. 1994, 216pp.

**TREASON AT MAASTRICHT** (Rodney Atkinson and Norris McWhirter) £3.50. A complete and detailed exposure of the illegal and unconstitutional action of the Tory Government in signing the Maastricht Treaty. 1994, 123pp.

**TRUTH OUT OF AFRICA, THE** (Ivor Benson) £4.40. Describes the effects of the 'Wind of Change' in Africa and the agencies responsible for the plight of that continent today. 3rd ed. 1995, xv, 92pp.

**VENTILATIONS** (Wilmot Robertson) £4.50. The sequel to the same author's widely acclaimed *The Dispossessed Majority*. Revised edition 1982, 113pp.

**WALL STREET AND THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION** (Anthony C. Sutton) £6.80. The links between Wall Street finance and the Russian Revolution are proved beyond all question by an established scholar. 1974, 228pp.

**WEALTH, VIRTUAL WEALTH AND DEBT** (Friedrick Soddy) £10.00. The author, a Nobel prize-winner in chemistry, points the way to a satisfactory and beneficial financial system. A long-established classic. 1926, rep. 1983, 320pp.

**WAR AND THE BREED** (David Jordan) £8.00. Fine reprinting of a remarkably far-seeing book, first published in 1915, which argued that the war then raging would do incalculable damage to the genetic make-up of Britain and Europe. Disturbing but fascinating. Hardback, 1981, 127pp.

**ZIONIST CONNECTION, THE** (Alfred Lilienthal) £19.00. Sensational and courageous exposé of Zionist power politics by a non-Zionist Jew. 1982, 904pp.



# ABEX steps up activity

Ron Amery, leader and Fenland group co-organiser of ABEX (Association of British Ex-Servicemen and Women), is doing a great job with various projects, articles and press coverage. In the Cambridgeshire town of March on January 27th, a tribute cross was laid at the war memorial in memory of victims of the Japanese death camps of World War II. The cross was made up of green bamboo (denoting the Far East), barbed wire (denoting captivity) and red poppies (denoting sacrifice). Several ex-servicemen observed a two-minute silence along with BNP members and their families.

## NATIONWIDE PLAN

There are plans to extend this designated day of tribute throughout Britain next year and indeed every year thereafter, with BNP branches and groups ordering uniform floral tributes for their ceremonies all over the UK. Fund-raising will take place for FEPOW (Children of Far East Prisoners of War) under the aegis of ABEX. A special January 27th badge is being considered. This will be an ongoing protest as well as a tribute. ABEX continues to campaign for justice, compensation and apologies from the Japanese. Being merely British, our lads are a long way down the ladder in the compensation stakes. We in the BNP say: "If you're not at the top of the ladder, stand at the bottom and shake it as hard as you can!"

Several local newspapers were in attendance at the March ceremony on January 27th.

## Asylum-seekers opposed

On January 22nd, Peterborough BNP activists covered the Cambridge villages of Oakington and Longstanton with leaflets opposing the flood of asylum-seekers. The former barracks at Oakington is to be used as an immigration reception centre and will accommodate up to 400. South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Policy Committee has said that the property will be given up to this use for a "temporary period" of between three and five years!

Andrew Lansley, the local MP (not opposed to the project) conceded in an interview that "every effort must be made to minimise the risk of turbulence in local services and the local environment." Meanwhile in Peterborough, the asylum-seekers took the bobbies by surprise, their arrival only being discovered when arrests were made for offences including shoplifting.

The majority of these people are being housed around the Gladstone Street area — which probably means that their new landlords are Asian. The BNP will be contacting councillors and asking them to keep a tight grip on housing benefit claims.

## Important announcement!

Would all readers please note that any orders or other items intended for *Spearhead*, Friends of *Spearhead* or *Spearhead* Recordings which are sent to our Welling PO Box should state our name clearly on the envelope. They should *not* be sent in the same envelope as other items intended for the British National Party or one of its subsidiaries and with the name of the BNP or subsidiaries on the envelope.

As most readers should know, the BNP and its subsidiaries are now operating from new addresses, different from our Welling address. Items of post received at Welling bearing the name of the BNP or subsidiaries on the envelope are passed on without the envelope being opened. This means that any items inside intended for *Spearhead*, etc., go on to the BNP and then have to be returned to us when they are found. This results in a two-fold delay in our dealing with such items.

Ensuring that *Spearhead* items are sent in separate envelopes, with our name on the envelopes, is the best way to get the quickest possible service.

## The Eleventh Hour

*The Eleventh Hour* has been described as the 'Bible' of the British National Party. First published in 1988, the new (1998) edition has been updated to take in the many new developments on the political scene occurring since. The book gives comprehensive coverage of all the major current issues affecting Britain. It delves into the ideologies of liberalism, conservatism and the left, and also examines that of British Nationalism and its background. It contains extensive analyses of the British economy and political system. It looks at issues connected with freedom and order, the mass media, the environment, race and immigration, Northern Ireland, the Commonwealth, foreign policy and defence. It also gives a detailed outline of the development of the BNP and its predecessor organisations in Britain.

*The Eleventh Hour* runs to 537 pages, it is partly autobiographical, giving an account of the author's origins, early political awakening and subsequent life's work.

Price: Hardback £25.00 plus £3.90 p&p; paperback £17.50 plus £3.05 p&p. Please send cheques to Albion Press, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

## How to obtain *Spearhead*

Make sure of your regular copy of *Spearhead* by becoming a subscriber. Fill in the form here and send it to us, together with payment, as directed. Please note also the rates for bulk-buyers.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ENCLOSED, SUBSCRIPTION OF.....

PLUS DONATION (IF ANY) OF.....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick box where applicable):-

British Isles: £22.50 ☐ Overseas surface mail: £24.60 ☐ Unsealed air mail Europe: £25.66 ☐ Unsealed air mail Middle East, Africa, N & S America: £32.30 ☐ Unsealed air mail Australasia, Far East: £33.90 ☐


**PLEASE NOTE:** These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If remittance is in any other currency, an additional charge of £4.50 is required in the case of cheques and money orders and £2.50 in the case of banknotes, these paying for banker's commission and charges.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:-

10-19 copies: £1.10 each; 20-49 copies: £1.00 each; 50-99 copies: 83p each; 100-199 copies: 69p each; 200-499 copies: 60p each; 500 copies or over: 55p each (For advice on postal rates please contact our office).

All cheques and postal or money orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW. Please do not include a payment for *Spearhead* in a remittance which includes payment for other items.


## JOHN TYNDALL



The book you must read if you want to find out what John Tyndall and the BNP stand for.



## Rally '98 video now available!



At last! The long-awaited video film of the British National Party's 1998 Annual Rally is now available. This film was made with TV-quality Betacam filming equipment. It should have been produced and available for sale in early 1999 at the latest but this did not happen. After the BNP leadership change-over that occurred in September of that year, the new party administration was asked if there was now any intention of producing and marketing the film in video form but the reply was that there was not. Thereupon, by negotiated agreement, *Spearhead* took over the task of production and now offers the video for sale.

The rally was possibly the best in the BNP's history. It took place at a smart venue in the West Midlands after successful attempts had been made by political opponents, including the Board of Deputies of British Jews, to get previous bookings of venues cancelled.

As usual, the film features reports by regional and departmental representatives. It then goes on to the main items on the agenda, which are the speeches by Nick Griffin (then Publicity Director), Richard Edmonds (then National Organiser) and John Tyndall (then party leader). An especially touching feature is the hugely effective collection appeal by Dave Bruce, which raised an amazing £12,000 for the all-important Euro Election Fund. Less than a month afterwards, Dave was no longer with us, having been tragically taken away by a heart attack.

See and hear these speakers at this stirring event as if you were there!

The video is titled *Rally '98* and is available at £15.92 post-free. It should be ordered from *Spearhead* Recordings, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW. Cheques should be made out to *Spearhead*.

## Northants BNP leaflet success

Under the energetic leadership of Organiser Dave Ball, the Northamptonshire BNP is growing at an amazing rate. Not only have the number of activists doubled since the group's launch in November, but now some consideration is being given to the party in the county reorganising into two units due to the success of its leaflet campaigns.

A hard core of active members has been formed in the south of the county, where they have increased their leaflet output by 100 per cent in quite a short time and seen a massive increase in enquiries.

Northants. BNP's message to others in the party is that ample leafleting is vital to growth. The potential support is there for the asking; it just remains for party members to make sure they go out and recruit it.

In accordance with the party's policy of units helping others in near proximity, it is intended that Northants. BNP will shortly be assisting in the setting up of a Bedfordshire Group.

All those in Northamptonshire interested in contacting their local BNP should write to PO Box 5900, Rushden, Northants. NN10 0ZB.

### Friends of *Spearhead*

## PROGRESS REPORT

*With three months now passed since the announcement of the Friends of Spearhead scheme, it is time to give readers a progress report.*

*As we go to press, 31 people have registered as Friends of Spearhead. This is most encouraging since it means that, presuming that these good people keep up their monthly payments, we are very near to making up the deficit in income resulting from reduced orders from British National Party branches.*

*Even in the latter regard, there is some good news: some branches which cancelled orders at*

*the end of last year have renewed them again.*

*Where our magazine is still losing money, is in respect of a fall in new subscribers. In the past, these were acquired at a slightly higher rate than that at which old subscribers lapsed; now the reverse is the case. The drop in new subscribers is due to the decision of the British National Party to discontinue sending complimentary *Spearheads* in information packs, which constituted our main form of advertising. Until we can find new ways of obtaining new subscribers, the income from Friends of Spearhead is going to be vital.*

## FRIENDS OF SPEARHEAD

Friends of *Spearhead* is a support group that has been formed for the purpose of ensuring our magazine's continued survival in new circumstances in which it is going to be facing reduced sales throughout the branch network of the British National Party due to the decision of the party leadership to launch a new and separate magazine.

Members of Friends of *Spearhead* will be asked to pay a subscription of a minimum of £10 a month, in return for which they may, if they wish, receive five copies of each monthly issue for redistribution (by whatever means they prefer). This subscription may be paid by ordinary cheque or monthly banker's order, in which case details of our bank and account number will be supplied on request.

In addition, Friends of *Spearhead* will be undertaking certain other promotions, details of which will be advertised as they occur.

We hope very much that our readers and supporters, not only in the UK but around the world, will rally to help us in this new project.

Friends of *Spearhead* can be contacted by posting to our usual address: PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.


## SPEARHEAD SUPPORT FUND

Income from the sales of our magazine is not enough to cover full production and administrative costs. We therefore rely on regular donations from our supporters so that we may remain solvent.


Also, because of the controversial nature of the opinions expressed in these columns, it is impossible to induce wholesale distributors to handle the magazine. Hence our need for additional financial support.

Please send all contributions to: *Spearhead*, c/o PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW. Please note that receipts are not normally sent for donations of less than £10 unless specifically requested, in which case an SAE would be much appreciated. Thanks.





Three of our visitors



They want to settle here

## THE AFGHANS

# Why do you think they chose here?

An airliner was hi-jacked during an internal flight in Afghanistan last month. The next thing we heard was that it was heading for Britain!

When it arrived (see picture above) at Stanstead Airport — surprise, surprise! A great many of the occupants were asking for asylum in this country.

Think — on its way westwards, the plane flew over or near several countries, including some quite prosperous ones in Europe. But there was never any doubt about its intended destination — dear old UK. Of course!

It's common knowledge everywhere that Britain is the world's number-one soft touch. The asylum-seekers knew they were on to a good thing heading for this country.

And they weren't disappointed. Within a short time of their landing they were being put up free at the local Hilton (rooms normally £202 a night). The latest is that they're at a refugee reception centre in Gloucestershire while their applications are being considered.


Which means that they're here to stay.

**Are you fed up to the back teeth with this country being the world's dumping ground? If so, you should be joining the BNP!**

For more information on the British National Party, write and send 50p to:-

The Secretary  
PO Box 287  
Waltham Cross  
Herts. EN8 8ZU  
Tel. 07774 454893

A room at the Hilton



OK if you can get it!

Name.....

Address.....

.....

.....

I enclose donation of.....

You can make a photocopy of this page or use a plain piece of paper if you don't want to cut up your copy of *Spearhead*.